



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 6]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, फरवरी 7, 1976/साघ 18, 1897

No. 6]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1976/MAGHA 18, 1897

इस भाग में सिम पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)

केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए सांख्यिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities  
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय

कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 17 जनवरी, 1976

का० प्रा० 568.—राष्ट्रपति संविधान के अनुच्छेद 399 के परतुक द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए संघ के सशस्त्र बल के अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसरों और उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसरों की प्रोन्नति के लिए पात्रता की शर्तों को विनियमित करने वाले निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं; अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम, प्रारम्भ और लागू होना :—(1) इन नियमों का नाम उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर और अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसर (प्रोन्नति के लिए पात्रता का अवधारण) नियम, 1975 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

(3) ये सभी वर्ग 1 और वर्ग 2 केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवाओं और पदों को जिनमें इंजीनियरी और चिकित्सा सेवाएं और पद भी सम्मिलित हैं, लागू होंगे।

2. परिभाषाएं :—इन नियमों में, जब तक कि संदर्भ से अन्यथा प्रयोजित न हो,—

(क) 'उन्मोचित आपातकालीन अफसर या अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसर के सम्बन्ध में, नियुक्ति की समष्टी जाने वाली तारीख' से सुसंगत नियमों के अनुसरण में, यथा संगणित नियुक्ति की तारीख अभिप्रेत है;

(ख) 'उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर या अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसर' से संघ के सशस्त्र बलों का ऐसा आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर या अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसर अभिप्रेत है जो किसी आरक्षित रिक्ति पर नियुक्त किया गया हो;

(ग) 'सुसंगत नियमों' से यथास्थिति उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर और अल्प सेवा कमीशन अधिकारी (रिक्तियों का आरक्षण) नियम, 1967 उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर और अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसर (रिक्तियों का आरक्षण) नियम, 1971 है उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर और अल्प सेवा कमीशन अफसर (इंजीनियरी और चिकित्सा सेवाएं) रिक्तियों का आरक्षण नियम, 1971 या उन्मोचित आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसर और अल्प सेवा कमीशन अधिकारी

(इंजीनियरी और चिकित्सा सेवाएं) रिक्तियों का आरक्षण  
(संख्या 2) नियम, 1971 अधिप्रेत है ;

(घ) 'आरक्षित रिक्तियों' से वह रिक्ति अधिप्रेत है जो सुसंगत नियमों के अधीन संघ के सशस्त्र बलों के आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसरों और अन्य सेवा कमीशन द्वारा भरे जाने के लिए आरक्षित है।

3. प्रोन्नति के लिए पात्रता :—किसी पद से सम्बन्धित सुसंगत भर्ती नियमों में निहित किसी भी बात के होते हुए भी ऐसे पद पर प्रोन्नति के लिए ऐसे उम्मीदवार आपातकालीन कमीशन अफसरों या अन्य सेवा कमीशन अफसरों के नामों पर भी जिन्होंने ऐसे पद पर प्रोन्नति द्वारा नियुक्ति के लिए ऐसे नियमों के अधीन यथा अपेक्षित, सेवा की अपेक्षित अवधि पूरी न की हो, विचार किया जाएगा, यदि—

- (i) उन्होंने परीक्षा की अवधि सफलतापूर्वक पूर्ण कर ली हो, और
- (ii) उनकी नियुक्ति की समझी जाने वाली तारीख से गणना की गई कुल सेवा, उस पद पर प्रोन्नति के लिए नियमों के अधीन अपेक्षित सेवा की अवधि से कम न हो।

4. निर्वाचन :—यदि इन नियमों के निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी कोई प्रश्न उठता है तो वह केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विनिश्चित किया जाएगा।

5. भर्ती नियमों का संशोधन :—ऐसे पदों, जिनको ये नियम लागू होते हैं, पर व्यक्तियों की विनियमित करने वाले सभी नियम, इन नियमों में उपबन्धित सीमा तक संशोधित समझे जायेंगे।

[सं० 9/20/74-स्थापना (सी)]

जे० एस० अहलुवालिया, प्रभार सचिव

#### CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 17th January, 1976

S.O. 568.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules to regulate the conditions of eligibility for promotion of released Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissioned Officers of the Armed Forces of the Union, namely :—

1 Short title, commencement and application.—(1) These rules may be called the Released Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissioned Officers (Determination of Eligibility for Promotion) Rules, 1975.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

(3) They shall apply to all Central Civil Services and posts, Class I and Class II, including Engineering and Medical Services and posts.

Definitions.—In these rules, unless the context otherwise requires,—

- (a) "deemed date of appointment" in relation to a released Emergency Commissioned Officer or a Short Service Commissioned Officer, means the date of appointment as computed in accordance with the relevant rules ;
- (b) "released Emergency Commissioned Officer or Short Service Commissioned Officer" means an Emergency Commissioned Officer or a Short Service Commissioned Officer of the Armed Forces of the Union who has been appointed to a reserved vacancy ;

(c) "relevant rules" means the Released Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissioned Officers (Reservation of Vacancies) Rules, 1967, the Released Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissioned Officers (Reservation of Vacancies) Rules, 1971, the Released Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissioned Officers (Engineering and Medical Services) Reservation of Vacancies Rules, 1971 or the Released Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissioned Officers (Engineering and Medical Services) Reservation of Vacancies (No. II) Rules, 1971, as the case may be ;

(d) "reserved vacancy" means a vacancy which is reserved under the relevant rules for being filled by the Emergency Commissioned Officers and Short Service Commissions of the Armed Forces of the Union.

3. Eligibility for promotion.—Notwithstanding anything contained in the relevant recruitment rules relating to any post, released Emergency Commissioned Officers or Short Service Commissioned Officers who have not put in the requisite period of service as required under such rules for appointment by promotion to such post shall be considered for promotion to such post if—

- (i) they have successfully completed the period of probation; and
- (ii) the total service reckoned from the deemed date of their appointment is not less than the period of service required under the rules for promotion to the post.

4. Interpretation.—If any question arises as to the interpretation of these rules, the same shall be decided by the Central Government.

5. Amendment of recruitment rules.—All rules regulating the recruitment of persons to posts to which these rules apply shall be deemed to have been amended to the extent provided for in these rules.

[No. 9/20/74-Ests(C)]

J. S. AHLUWALIA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 17 जनवरी, 1976

का० घा० 569.—जांच आयोग अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 60) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत के राजपत्र प्रसाधारण भाग II खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (ii) दिनांक 16 फरवरी, 1971 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय (कार्यिक विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या 375/31/71-ए०बी०डी०-3 (का०घा० 3863) दिनांक 16 फरवरी, 1971 में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित और संशोधित करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना के पैरा 2 में, "15 नवम्बर, 1975 तक" शब्दों, अंकों और प्रक्षरों के स्थान पर "24 नवम्बर, 1975 तक" शब्द, अंक और प्रक्षर प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएं।

[संख्या 381/12/73-ए०बी०डी०-3]

रमेश चन्द्र मिश्र, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th January, 1976

S.O. 569.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 (60 of 1952), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Cabinet Secretariat (Department of Personnel) No. 375/31/71-AVD(III) (S.O. 3863), and dated the 16th October, 1971, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 16th October, 1971, namely :—

In paragraph 2 of the said notification, for the words, figures and letters "by the 15th November, 1975", the words, figures and letters, "by the 24th November, 1975" shall be substituted.

[No. 381/12/73-AVD. III]

R. C. MISRA, Jt. Secy.

## भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

नई दिल्ली, 8 जनवरी, 1976

क्र० प्र० 570.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 22 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निर्वाचन आयोग यह निदेश देता है कि उसकी अधिसूचना सं० 434/कर्णा/75 (2) तारीख 15 मार्च, 1975 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किए जायेंगे :—

उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में,—

- (i) मद संख्या 3 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "7. उपायुक्त के जिला विकास सहायक, जिला रायचूर, रायचूर" के स्थान पर, "7. समुन्नति-कर अधिकारी, मानवी" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी;
- (ii) मद सं० 4 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "6. उप-प्रशासक, तुंगभद्रा परियोजना मुनीराबाद", के स्थान पर, "6-समुन्नति-कर अधिकारी, गन्नावडी," प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी;
- (iii) मद सं० 4 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "9. उपायुक्त के जिला विकास सहायक, जिला रायचूर, रायचूर" के स्थान पर, "9-समुन्नति-कर अधिकारी, मानवी" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी ;
- (iv) मद सं० 6 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "8. उपायुक्त के खाद्य तथा सिविल आपूर्ति सहायक, जिला शिमोगा, शिमोगा" के स्थान पर, "8-समुन्नति-कर अधिकारी, होन्नाली ।" प्रविष्टि रखी जायेगी ;
- (v) मद सं० 7 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि, "5 विशेष भूमि अर्जन आफिसर, चित्रदुर्ग ।" के स्थान पर, "5-उपायुक्त के जिला विकास सहायक, जिला चित्रदुर्ग, चित्रदुर्ग ।" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी;
- (vi) मद सं० 7 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "6 उत्पादक शुल्क अधीक्षक, जिला तुमकुर, तुमकुर" के स्थान पर, "6. उपायुक्त के जिला विकास सहायक, तुमकुर जिला तुमकुर ।" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी;
- (vii) मद सं० 8 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "4-उपायुक्त के खाद्य तथा सिविल आपूर्ति सहायक, जिला तुमकुर, तुमकुर ।" के पश्चात्, "5. उपायुक्त, शहर नगरपालिका परिषद्, तुमकुर ।" प्रविष्टि जोड़ दी आयगी ;
- (viii) मद सं० 10 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "4. परियोजना आफिसर, कोलार ।" के स्थान पर "4. परियोजना मूल्यांकन आफिसर, सूखाग्रस्त क्षेत्र विकास प्राधिकरण, कोलार ।" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी ;
- (ix) मद सं० 21 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "5. विशेष भूमि अर्जन आफिसर, टी०बी० परियोजना, शिमोगा," के स्थान पर "5. समुन्नति-कर अधिकारी, शिमोगा" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी;
- (x) मद सं० 24 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "5. परियोजना आफिसर, सूखाग्रस्त क्षेत्र परियोजना, धारवाड़" के स्थान पर "5 साख योजना आफिसर सूखाग्रस्त क्षेत्र विकास प्राधिकरण, धारवाड़ ।" प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी ;
- (xi) मद सं० 27 के सामने, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि "6 उपायुक्त के खाद्य तथा सिविल आपूर्ति सहायक, जिला बीजापुर, बीजापुर ।" के पश्चात्, "7. समुन्नति-कर अधिकारी, घाट प्रभा परियोजना, जामखण्डी ।" प्रविष्टि जोड़ दी जाएगी ।

[सं० 434/कर्णा/75(1)]

## ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 8th January, 1976

S.O. 570.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 22 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby directs that the following amendments shall be made in its notification No. 434/KT/75(2) dated 15th March, 1975 namely :—

In column 2 of the Table appended to the said notification :—

- (i) against item No. 3, for the existing entry, "7. District Development Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Raichur District, Raichur", the entry, "7. Betterment Levy Officer, Manvi," shall be substituted;
- (ii) against item No. 4, for the existing entry, "6. Deputy Administrator, Tungabhadra Project, Munirabad," the entry "6. Betterment Levy Officer, Gangavathi", shall be substituted ;
- (iii) against item No. 4, for the existing entry, "9. District Development Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner. Raichur, District, Raichur," the entry, "9 Betterment Levy Officer, Manvi," shall be substituted ;
- (iv) against item No. 6, for the existing entry, "8. Food and Civil Supplies Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, Shimoga", the entry, "8. Betterment Levy Officer, Honnali," shall be substituted.
- (v) against item No. 7, for the existing entry, "5. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Chitradurga," the entry, "5. District Development Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Chitradurga District, Chitradurga," shall be substituted.
- (vi) against item No. 7, for the existing entry, "6. Superintendent of Excise, Tumkur District, Tumkur," the entry, "6. District Development Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, Tumkur," shall be substituted,
- (vii) against item No. 8, after the existing entry, "4. Food and Civil Supplies Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District, Tumkur," the entry, "5. Commissioner City Municipal Council, Tumkur," shall be added,
- (viii) against item No. 10, for the existing entry, "4. Project Officer, Kolar," the entry, "4. Project Evaluation Officer, Drought Prone Area Development Authority, Kolar," shall be substituted,
- (ix) against item No. 21, for the existing entry, "5. Special Land Acquisition Officer, T.B. Project, Shimoga," the entry, "5. Betterment Levy Officer, Shimoga," shall be substituted,
- (x) against item No. 24, for the existing entry, "5. Project Officer, Drought Prone Area Project, Dharwar," the entry, "5. Credit Planning Officer, Drought Prone Area Development Authority, Dharwar," shall be substituted,
- (xi) against item No. 27, after the existing entry "6. Food and Civil Supplies Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Bijapur District, Bijapur," the entry, "Betterment Levy Officer, Ghataprabha Project, Jamkhandi," shall be added.

[No. 434/KT/75(1)]

भारत

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 1976

क्र० प्र० 571.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1975 में हुए गुजरात विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 148-सावली निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार

श्री शान्तीलाल छगनलाल शाह, मीक्सी, ताल्लुका सावली, जिला बड़ोदा, (गुजरात), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा सद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्वीकारण नहीं किया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है,

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद् द्वारा उक्त श्री शान्तीलाल छगनलाल शाह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० गुज०/वि०स०/146/75(8)]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th January, 1976

**S.O. 571.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Shantilal Chhaganlal Shah, At & P.O. Moxi, Taluka Savli District Baroda (Gujarat), a contesting candidate in the general election held in June 1975, to the Gujarat Legislative Assembly from 146-Savli constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Shantilal Chhaganlal Shah to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. GJ/LA/146/75(8)]

#### प्रादेश

का० प्रा० 572.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1975 में हुए गुजरात विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 149-राओपुरा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री छोटा लाल जीवराजभाई पटेल, राजमहल रोड, पैलेस रेस्टोरेन्ट, बड़ोदा-1, (गुजरात), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा सद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्वीकारण नहीं किया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद् द्वारा उक्त श्री छोटा लाल जीवराजभाई पटेल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा

विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० गुज०/वि०स०/149/75(9)]

#### ORDER

**S.O. 572.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chhotalal Jivarajbhai Patel, Rajmahal Road, Palace Restaurant, Baroda-1 (Gujarat), a contesting candidate in the general election held in June 1975 to the Gujarat Legislative Assembly from 149-Raopura constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chhotalal Jivarajbhai Patel to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. GJ/LA/149/75(9)]

#### प्रादेश

का० प्रा० 573.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून 1975 में हुए गुजरात विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 149-राओपुरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जीवनलाल नरसिंहदास ठक्कर, डा० अप्पे की बिस-पेन्सरी बिल्डिंग, कोठीनाका, बड़ोदा (गुजरात), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा सद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्वीकारण नहीं किया है और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद् द्वारा उक्त श्री जीवनलाल नरसिंहदास ठक्कर को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० गुज०/वि०स०/149/75(10)]

वी० नागसुब्रह्मण्यन, सचिव

#### ORDER

**S.O. 573.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Jivanlal Narsinhadas Thakkar, Dr. Apte's Dispensary Building, Kothi Naka, Baroda (Gujarat), a contesting candidate in the general election held in June 1975 to the Gujarat Legislative Assembly from 149-Raopura constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Jivanlal Narsinhdas Thakkar to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. GJ/LA/149/75(10)]

V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 1975

का० प्रा० 574.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 411-कैराना निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री करीमुल्ला, मोहल्ला कस्साबान, कैराना, जिला मुजफ्फरनगर उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री करीमुल्ला को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०/वि०स०/411/74(470)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1975

S.O. 574.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Karimullah, Mohalla Kassaban, Kairana, District Muzaffarnagar Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 411-Kairana assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Karimullah to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/411/74(470)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 दिसम्बर, 1975

का० प्रा० 575.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 418-सहारनपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री ताहिर हसन, मुहल्ला लखीगेट, सहारनपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने

निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री ताहिर हसन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०/वि०स०/418/74(486)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th December, 1975

S.O. 575.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Tahir Hasan, Mohalla Lakhi Gate, Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 418-Saharanpur assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Tahir Hasan to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/418/74(486)]

आदेश

का० प्रा० 576.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 417-हरोड़ा (अ०जा०) निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बलजीत, ग्राम कौरो मझरा, जिला सहारनपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री बलजीत को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०/वि०स०/417/74(487)]

## ORDER

**S.O. 576.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Baljit, Village Kori Majra, District Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 417-Harora (SC) assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Baljit to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/417/74(487)]

आदेश

**क्र०प्रा० 577.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 413-नकुड़ निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री विशम्भर, ग्राम सिरगका, पो० नकुड़, जिला सहारनपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री विशम्भर को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०/वि०स०/413/74(488)]

## ORDER

**S.O. 577.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Bishambher, Village Siraska, P.O. Nakur, District Saharanpur Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 413-Nakur assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Bishambher to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/413/74(488)]

आदेश

**क्र०प्रा० 578.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन

के लिए 413-नकुड़ निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम निवाज, ग्राम पिलखनी, पोसे रणदेवा, जिला सहारनपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री राम निवाज को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०/वि०स०, 413/74(489)]

## ORDER

**S.O. 578.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Niwas, Village Pilakhani, P.O. Randeva, District Saharanpur Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 413-Nakur assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Niwas to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/413/74(489)]

आदेश

**क्र० प्रा० 579.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 413-नकुड़ निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बालेश्वर कुमार, ग्राम ब पो० नकुड़, जिला सहारनपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा रीति से दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार के अव्यावधान पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री बालेश्वर कुमार को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ० प्र०/वि० स०/413/74(490)]

ORDER

**S.O. 579.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Baleshwar Kumar, Village & P.O. Nakur, District Saharanpur Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 413-Nakur assembly constituency, has failed to lodge his account of election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation of the said candidate, the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Baleshwar Kumar to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/413/74(490)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 दिसम्बर, 1975

**क्र० प्रा० 580.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 420-रुड़की निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री माम चन्द, ग्राम व पोस्ट मन्नुधांस, तहसील रुड़की, जिला सहारनपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बसाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा रीति से दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार के अप्रत्यावदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अत्र, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10A के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री माम चन्द को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ० प्रा०-वि० सं०/420/74(496)]

ए० एन० सैन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th December, 1975

**S.O. 580.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mam Chand, Village & P. O. Mannubans, Tahsil Roorkee, District Saharanpur Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 420-Roorkee assembly constituency, has failed to lodge his account of election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation of the said candidate, the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mam Chand to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/420/74(496)]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(न्याय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 1976

**क्र० प्रा० 581.**—लेख्य-प्रमाणक (नोटरीज) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 53वां) की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा वर्ष 1976 के आरम्भ में नियुक्त किये गये और कार्य कर रहे लेख्य-प्रमाणकों (नोटरीज) की सूची प्रकाशित करती है:—

क्र० सं०	लेख्य-प्रमाणक (नोटरी) का नाम	निवास स्थान तथा व्यावसायिक पता	योग्यता	किस क्षेत्र में काम करने के लिए प्राधिकृत है।	टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	श्री चक्रवर्ती शोरास्वामी	कैथोलिक सेंटर (दूसरी मंजिल), 6, ग्रामेनियन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1	अधिवक्ता, मद्रास उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
2.	श्री रुस्तम अद्वैत गगरात	बारा मीसर्स गगरात एन्ड कम्पनी सालि-सिटर्स एन्ड नोटरी पब्लिक, अली नैम्बर्स, मोडोज स्ट्रीट, बम्बई-1	अधिवक्ता, बम्बई उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
3.	श्री बाटा कृष्ण बनर्जी	कुंज निवास, 23ए, सरदार प्रंकर रोड, थाना टासीगंज, कलकत्ता	अधिवक्ता, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
4.	श्री भगवती प्रसाद खेतान	1-बी ओल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता 1	न्यायवादी, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
5.	श्री रवीन्द्र कृष्ण देव	टैम्पल चैम्बर्स, 6, ओल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता 1	न्यायवादी, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
6.	श्री अग्रणेश नाथ टैगोर	29, पांडित्या रोड, कलकत्ता और 6, हेस्टिंग्स स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता 1	अधिवक्ता, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पश्चिम बंगाल में और संघ शासित क्षेत्र पांडि-चेरी जिसमें ओरोबिने भी शामिल है।	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	श्री हिमांशु प्रकाश गंगुली	4, टसर बत्त लेन, हायडा पश्चिम बंगाल)	अधिवक्ता, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
8.	श्री कूमजी कुरसेतजी हीरजी-भाई रसतमजी	रायश इंगोरेस बिल्डिंग, 5 व 7, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता	सालिसीटर, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
9.	श्री सुधीर कुमार डे मलिक	ठारा मार्टिन वर्न लि०, 12-मिशनरो एक्सटेंशन, कलकत्ता-1	न्यायवादी, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
10.	श्री राण मोहन चटर्जी	द्वारा मैसर्स श्री०, विगनम एन्ड को०, सालिसिटर्स, 29, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता	सालिसीटर कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पश्चिम बंगाल, असम, बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश तथा पंजाब ।	—
11.	श्री प्रभुबाल हिममल्लिका	6, ब्रौड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता	न्यायवादी, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
12.	श्री पुष्पव्रत बोस	10, किरण शंकर राय रोड, कलकत्ता-1	न्यायवादी, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
13.	श्री बिक्टर हलियास मोसेज	6, ब्रौड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता	न्यायवादी, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—
14.	श्री मुख्तार वधानन	अधिवक्ता, जलंधर सिटी, पंजाब ।	अधिवक्ता, पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	पंजाब तथा उत्तर प्रदेश	—
15.	श्री मनोहर लाल कपूर	3/9, पटेल नगर (पूर्व), नई दिल्ली	अधिवक्ता	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	—
16.	श्री हर प्रसाद मेहरा	नं० 3060, चखेवाला, दिल्ली ।	अधिवक्ता, पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	—
17.	श्री गंगा किशन कपूर	318, जी० टी० रोड, जलंधर सिटी, पंजाब	अधिवक्ता, पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	पंजाब तथा उत्तर प्रदेश	—
18.	श्री मेहर चन्द मेहरा	161, मोडल टाउन, अम्बाला सिटी (हरियाणा)	अधिवक्ता, पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	अम्बाला जिला	—
19.	श्री राम दिता मल	7/13, पटेल नगर, (पूर्व), नई दिल्ली	अधिवक्ता, उच्च न्यायालय	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र, राजस्थान, पंजाब तथा उत्तर प्रदेश ।	—
20.	श्री बृजबहादुर अग्निहोत्री	सीतापुर, उत्तर प्रदेश	वकील	जिला सीतापुर (उत्तर प्रदेश)	—
21.	श्री जयनलाल प्ररोडा	10, न्यू कोर्ट रोड, अमृतसर (पंजाब)	अधिवक्ता	जिला अमृतसर पंजाब	—
22.	श्री दामोदर देवजी वामोदर	द्वारा मैसर्स कांगा एन्ड को०, सालिसीटर्स, मेणन्स, 43, बीर निर्माण रोड, बम्बई ।	सालिसीटर	महाराष्ट्र	—
23.	श्री देव प्रसाद घोष	12, गवर्नमेंट प्लेस, (पूर्व), कलकत्ता-1	न्यायवादी	पूरे भारत में	—
24.	श्री नाथमल हिममल्लिका	6, ब्रौड पोस्ट आफिस, स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता	न्यायवादी	पूरे भारत में	—
25.	श्री रामकृष्ण गर्ग	वकील नं० 6456, रावतवाड़ा, आगरा (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वकील, आगरा	जिला आगरा]	—
26.	श्री सी० एच० पार्दोवाला	सालिसीटर द्वारा मैसर्स कावफोर्ड वेले एन्ड को०, स्टेट बैंक बिल्डिंग, बैंक स्ट्रीट, बम्बई ।	सालिसीटर	पूरे भारत में	—
27.	श्री सचिन्द्र सी० सैन	न्यायवादी, टैम्पल बैम्बर्स, पहली मंजिल, 6, ब्रौड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता ।	न्यायवादी	कलकत्ता	—
28.	श्री सुबोध कुमार मलिक	सालिसीटर, द्वारा मैसर्स संदरसंस एन्ड मोरगन्स, सालिसीटर्स रायल इंगोरेन्स बिल्डिंग, 5 व 7, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता	सालिसीटर	पूरे भारत में	—
29.	श्री बी० ए० मेहता	अधिवक्ता, 43, बी हनुमान रोड, नई दिल्ली ।	बार-एट-ला	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	—
30.	श्री दुर्गा प्रसाद तुलसीयान	अधिवक्ता, मुनमुनु (राजस्थान)	अधिवक्ता	जिला मुनमुनु	—



1	2	3	4	5	6
31. श्री जसवंत नारायण	अधिवक्ता, उदय मंदिर जोधपुर (राजस्थान)	अधिवक्ता	जोधपुर (राजस्थान)	—	
32. श्री मनोहर लाल गिरधर लाल शोसित	सालिसीटर, द्वारा भाई शंकर कांगा, एन्ड गिरधरलाल, सालिसीटर्स, गुजरात समाजल भवन, खानपुर, अहमदाबाद।	न्यायवादी, बम्बई उच्च न्यायालय	गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र	—	
33. श्री हैदर मिर्जा	अधिवक्ता, फाटक शेख सलीम, वाराणसी (उत्तर प्रदेश)	अधिवक्ता	वाराणसी डिजीजन (उत्तर प्रदेश)	—	
34. श्री नूर मोहम्मद	अधिवक्ता, उदयपुर, राजस्थान	अधिवक्ता	जिला उदयपुर	—	
35. श्री सुधीर कुमार शील	द्वारा मैसर्स संवरसंस एन्ड मोरगन्ज, सालिसीटर्स रायल इण्डोरेन्स भवन, 8 व 7 नेता जी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-1	सालिसीटर	पूरे भारत में	—	
36. श्री जितेन्द्र नाथ सन्यास	द्वारा मैसर्स संवरसंस एन्ड मोरगन्ज, इण्डोरेन्स भवन, 5 व 7 नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-1	सालिसीटर	पूरे भारत में	—	
37. श्री इन्द्र सैन इसरानी	अधिवक्ता, जे०-54 कृष्ण मार्ग, जयपुर (राजस्थान)	अधिवक्ता	जयपुर शहर और जिला	—	
38. श्री पी० सी० कुरियन	333, यम्बू चेट्टी स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1	अधिवक्ता	मद्रास तथा केरल	—	
39. श्री गुरुदयाल सिंह सिधू	मं० 1, डेकोहा, जलंधर (पंजाब)	अधिवक्ता	जिला जलंधर	—	
40. श्री सी० एस० बैकटसुब्बा-मणियन्	140 असकट रोड, कोयम्बटूर-12	अधिवक्ता	जिला कोयम्बटूर	—	
41. श्री पुष्कर लाल	एफ-2, भगत सिंह मार्केट, मेडोहाडिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली तथा एफ-1 शंकर मार्केट, कनाट सर्कस, नई दिल्ली।	अधिवक्ता	पूरे भारत में	—	
42. श्री बुनी लाल भाटिया	सी 4ए/68 सी, अनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली।	अधिवक्ता	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र।	—	
43. श्री रामजीदास सिंगल	गुरुद्वारा स्ट्रीट, भटिन्डा (पंजाब)	अधिवक्ता	जिला भटिन्डा	—	
44. श्री देवराज सिंह त्यागी	अधिवक्ता, कलकटोरेट कोर्ट, बुलन्दशहर, उत्तर प्रदेश	अधिवक्ता	जिला बुलन्दशहर (उत्तर प्रदेश)	—	
45. श्री बाल कृष्ण	अधिवक्ता, हनुमानगढ़ टाऊन, जिला गंगानगर (राजस्थान)	अधिवक्ता	जिला गंगा नगर मुख्य कार्यालय हनुमानगढ़ (राजस्थान) में।	—	
46. श्री एस० भार० मेहता	अधिवक्ता, बलीना (राजस्थान)	अधिवक्ता	जिला बाड़मेर व जालौर मुख्य कार्यालय बलीना (राजस्थान)	—	
47. श्री बी० बी० कक्कर	अधिवक्ता, 36/9 पूर्वी टेल नगर, नई दिल्ली-6।	अधिवक्ता	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	—	
48. श्री जी० सी० वर्मा	अधिवक्ता, ओय कमिशनर ई०/12 ग्रीन पार्क, नई दिल्ली।	अधिवक्ता व ओय कमिशनर	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	—	
49. श्री पी० एल० गांधी	अधिवक्ता, गांधी बाग के सामने, सूरत	अधिवक्ता	सूरत जिला	—	
50. श्री ए० भार० भस्कानी	अधिवक्ता, बी० बी० जेड०-8, गांधी-धाम, (कच्छ)	अधिवक्ता	जिला कच्छ का अंजार तालुक	—	
51. श्री एन० सी० शाह	द्वारा खेतान एन्ड को०, सालिसीटर, 1 बी, प्रोड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1	अधिवक्ता कलकत्ता	कलकत्ता और नई दिल्ली	—	
52. श्री टी० बलीपतिह	द्वारा मैसर्स किंग एन्ड परट्रिज, बूसरी मंजिल, कैथोलिक सेंटर, आर्मेनियम स्ट्रीट, पो० बाक्स नं० 121, मद्रास-1	अधिवक्ता, मद्रास	पूरे भारत में	—	

1	2	3	4	5	6
53. श्री जे० आर० गगरात	द्वारा मैसर्स गगरात एन्ड को०, अल्ली चैम्बर्स, नाथिनदास मास्टर रोड फोर्ड, बम्बई-1	अधिवक्ता बम्बई	पूरे भारत में	—	—
54. श्री आर० सेतलूर	द्वारा काफोर्ड बेने एन्ड को०, स्टेट बैंक बिल्डिंग, बैंक स्ट्रीट, बम्बई-1	अटार्नी तथा अधिवक्ता बम्बई	पूरे भारत में	—	—
55. श्री ब्रजमोहन मेहता	13-ए/2, राजेन्द्र नगर, नई दिल्ली 1	अधिवक्ता, नई दिल्ली	दिल्ली मंत्र शासित क्षेत्र	—	—
56. श्री नैनी गोपाल वत्स	56/1, एम एन सेन मेन, तौली गंज, जिला 24 परगना, प० बंगाल 1	अधिवक्ता कलकत्ता	जिला 24 परगना अलीपुर, कलकत्ता	—	—
57. श्री सुरजीत सिंह	23, नेताजी पार्क, जलंधर सिटी (पंजाब)	अधिवक्ता जलंधर	जलंधर	—	—
58. श्री जगजीत सिंह	376-एल, मोडल टाऊन, जलंधर सिटी (पंजाब)	अधिवक्ता	जलंधर	—	—
59. श्री के० जे० खम्बाता	राजब महल, 144 क्वीन्स रोड, बम्बई-20	अधिवक्ता बम्बई 1	पूरे भारत में	—	—
60. श्री अम्बेलाख बाबा भाई पटेल	विद्या स्ट्रीट, डाकखाना नवसारी, जिला बुलसार (गुजरात)	अधिवक्ता	बुलसार जिला गुजरात	—	—
61. श्री पूनम चन्व सोमचन्द शाह	द्वारा मैसर्स पूर्णानन्द एंड को०, सालि-सीटर्स, गुजरात सरकार 1 'अर्द्धेय' हरिदास कालोनी, जन जीवन प्रेस रोड, अहमदाबाद-14	अधिवक्ता	गुजरात	—	—
62. श्री नवल एस० फटर तेकर	द्वारा मैसर्स काफोर्ड बेने एन्ड को० स्टेट बैंक बिल्डिंग, बैंक स्ट्रीट, बम्बई 1	अधिवक्ता तथा अटार्नी, बम्बई उच्च न्यायालय	पूरे भारत में	—	—
63. श्री जगन माध	मोगा, जिला फरीदकोट (पंजाब)	अधिवक्ता	जिला फरीदकोट	—	—
64. श्री बी० टी० मर्चेन्ट	द्वारा मैसर्स ठाकुर बास एन्ड मङ्गायकर, फोर्ट चैम्बर्स, डीनलेन फोर्ट, बम्बई-400001 1	अटार्नी तथा अधिवक्ता	पूरे भारत में	—	—
65. श्री वस्तम आर० दादाबन्जी	घुन बिल्डिंग, प्रथम मंजिल 23/25, धोगा स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बम्बई 1	अधिवक्ता	ग्रेटर बम्बई	—	—
66. श्री एच० एस० भगत	द्वारा अम्बूभाई व दीवान जी, लेटिन चैम्बर्स, दलाल स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बम्बई 1 तथा द्वारा अम्बूभाई व दीवानजी, सालिसीटर्स, एन्ड एडवोकेट्स, बैंक आफ इंडिया बिल्डिंग अहमदाबाद-380001	अधिवक्ता तथा सालिसीटर	गुजरात	—	—
67. श्री एच० बी० छत्रपति	द्वारा मैसर्स भयशंकर कांगा एन्ड गिरधर लाल, मानिकजी बाडिया बिल्डिंग, बेल लेन, फोर्ट, बम्बई-400001 तथा द्वारा मैसर्स भयशंकर कांगा एन्ड गिरधर-लाल, गुजरात समाचार भवन, धान-पुर, अहमदाबाद-380001	अधिवक्ता तथा सालिसीटर	गुजरात	—	—
68. श्री जी० एस० आस	35, लावण्य नगर, जोयराज पार्क, रोड, एलिस भिज, अहमदाबाद-7	अधिवक्ता	अहमदाबाद	—	—
69. श्री अमर सिंह	जमियस सिंह रोड, मोगा जिला फरीद-कोट, पंजाब 1	अधिवक्ता	मोगा, जिला फरीदकोट (पंजाब)	—	—
70. श्री बी० एच० अंतिया	द्वारा मैसर्स मुल्ला एन्ड सन्ड श्रेगोब्लन्ट एन्ड कारों, सालिसीटर्स एन्ड टेदेरीज, अहलीर बाडिया, बिल्डिंग, 51, महात्मा गांधी रोड, बम्बई-400001	अटार्नी तथा अधिवक्ता	ग्रेटर बम्बई	—	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
71.	श्री बी० पी० शुक्ल	रगनाथ बिल्डिंग, टाउन हाल के सामने, अधिवक्ता राजकोट (गुजरात)		राजकोट तथा जूनागढ़ जिले	—
72.	श्री बी० के० शाह	बनानी निवास, नानी छिपवाड, बड़ौदा-6 अधिवक्ता		बड़ौदा	—
73.	श्री रमेश जे० मेहता	अधिवक्ता, नडियाद (जिला कैरा), अधिवक्ता गुजरात राज्य		कैरा तथा पंचमहल जिले	—
74.	श्री अमर चन्द दत्त	द्वारा मैसर्स फोर्लर एन्ड को०, 12, अधिवक्ता गवर्नमेंट प्लेस ईस्ट, कलकत्ता-1		कलकत्ता	—
75.	श्री बसंतलाल बी० मेहता	द्वारा मालवी रंजोदास एन्ड को०, सालि- सीटर्स एन्ड एडवोकेट्स, यूसूफ बिल्डिंग, महात्मा गांधी रोड, फोर्ट, बम्बई-400001	सालिसीटर	महाराष्ट्र	—
76.	श्री जी० बी० भट्ट	द्वारा भट्ट और सलजाना मेकर भवन-1, नई मारीन लाईन, बम्बई-20	प्रदार्नी और अधिवक्ता	पूरे भारत में	—
77.	श्री मिलवा राम काशिया	33/16, राजेन्द्र नगर, नई दिल्ली 1	अधिवक्ता पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	दिल्ली संघ शामिल क्षेत्र	—
78.	श्री प्रकाश चन्द जैन	82, धुरबाग, वेहराबून	अधिवक्ता	पश्चिम उत्तराखंड (यू० पी०) के साथ मुख्य कार्यालय वेहराबून	—
79.	श्री मोहज एफ० करमालावाला	चर्च गेट चैम्बर 5, नई मारीन लाईन कमरा नं० 611, 6 फ्लोर बम्बई-20	सालिसीटर	पूरे महाराष्ट्र के साथ मुख्य कार्यालय बम्बई 1	—

[सं० 22/1/76-न्याय]

भार० एल० परदीप, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS  
(Department of Justice)

New Delhi, the 16th January, 1976

S.O. 581.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 6 of the Notaries Act, 1952 (53 of 1952), the Central Government hereby publishes a list of Notaries appointed by them in practice at beginning of the year 1976:—

Sl. No.	Name of Notary	Residential & Professional address	Qualifications	Area in which he is authorised to practise	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Shri Chakravarthi Doraswamy.	Catholic Centre (2nd Floor) 6, Armenian Street Madras-1.	Advocate Madras High Court.	Whole of India	—
2.	Sh. Rustam Ardeshir Gagrati.	C/o M/s. Gagrati & Co. Solicitors & Notary Public, Alli Chambers, Meadows Street, Bombay-1.	Advocate Bombay High Court.	Whole of India	—
3.	Sh. Bata Krishna Banarji.	Koonja Nibas, 23-A, Sardar Shankar Road, P.S. Tillygunje, Calcutta.	Advocate Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
4.	Sh. Bhagwati Prasad Khaitan.	1-B, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
5.	Shri Rabindra Krishna Deb.	Tempo Chambers, 6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
6.	Shri Arunendra Nath Tagore.	29, Pandit Road, Calcutta and 6, Hastings Street, Calcutta.	Advocate Calcutta High Court.	West Bengal & Union Territory of Pondicherry including Auroville.	—
7.	Shri Himansu Prakash Ganguli.	4 Issur Dutt Lane, Howrah (West Bengal).	Advocate Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
8.	Shri Framjee Cursetjee Heerjeebhoy Rustomjee.	Royal Insurance Bldg. 5 & 7, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta.	Solicitors, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
9.	Shri Sudhir Kumar Dey Mullick.	C/o Martin Burn Ltd., 12 Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1.	Attorney-at Law, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
10.	Shri Rash Mohan Chatterjee.	C/o M/s. Orrignam & Co., Solicitors, 29, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.	Solicitors Calcutta High Court.	West Bengal, Assam, Bihar, U.P., and Punjab.	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	Shri Prabhudaya Himatsingka.	6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
12.	Shri Punyabrata Bose.	10, Kiran Shankar Roy Road, Calcutta-1.	Attorney-at Law, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
13.	Shri Victor Elias Moses.	6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, Calcutta High Court.	Whole of India.	—
14.	Shri Mulkh Raj Wadhwani.	Advocate, Jullundur City, Punjab.	Advocate Punjab High Court.	Punjab and U.P.	—
15.	Shri Manoharlal Kapur.	3/9 Patel Nagar, (East), New Delhi.	Advocate	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
16.	Shri Herpershad Mehra.	No. 3060, Charkhewalan, Delhi.	Advocate Punjab High Court.	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
17.	Shri Ganga Bishan Kapur.	318, G.T. Road, Jullundur City, Punjab.	Advocate Punjab High Court.	Punjab and U.P.	—
18.	Shri Mehr Chand Mehra.	161, Model Town, Ambala City (Haryana).	Advocate Punjab High Court.	Ambala District.	—
19.	Shri Ram Ditta Mall.	7/13, Patel Nagar (East), New Delhi.	Advocate Supreme Court	Union Territory of Delhi, Rajasthan, Punjab and U.P.	—
20.	Shri Brij Bahadur Agnihotri.	Sitapur, U.P.	Vakil	Sitapur District, U.P.	—
21.	Shri Chaman Lal Arora.	10, New Court Road, Amritsar (Punjab).	Advocate	Amritsar District (Punjab).	—
22.	Shri Damodar Devji Damodar.	C/o M/s. Kanga & Co., Solicitors Ready-money Mansions, 43 Veer Nirman Road, Bombay.	Solicitor	Maharashtra.	—
23.	Shri Deba Prasad Ghosh.	12, Govt. Place East, Calcutta-1.	Attorney	Whole of India.	—
24.	Shri Nathmal Himatsingka.	6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney	Whole of India.	—
25.	Shri Ram Krishan Garg.	Vakil, No. 6456, Rawatpara, Agra (U.P.)	Vakil Agra	Agra District.	—
26.	Shri C.H. Pardiwala.	Solicitor, C/o M/s. Crawford Baylay & Co., State Bank Buildings, Bank St. Bombay.	Solicitor	Whole of India.	—
27.	Shri Sachindra C. Sen.	Attorney-at-law, Temple Chambers 1st Floor, 6, Old Post Office, St. Calcutta.	Attorney	Calcutta.	—
28.	Shri Subodh Kumar Mullick.	Solicitor, C/o, M/s. Sandersons & Morgans, Solicitors, Royal Insurance Bldgs., 5 & 7 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.	Solicitor	Whole of India.	—
29.	Shri D.A. Mehta.	Advocate, 43-B, Hanuman Road, New Delhi.	Bar-at-Law	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
30.	Shri Durga Prasad Tulsyan.	Advocate, Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan).	Advocate	Jhunjhunu District (Rajasthan)	—
31.	Shri Jaswant Narain.	Advocate, Udai Mandir, Jodhpur (Rajasthan).	Advocate	Jodhpur (Rajasthan)	—
32.	Shri Manoharlal Girdharlal Doshi.	Solicitor, C/o Bhai Shankar Kanga & Girdhar Lal, Solicitors, Gujarat Samachal Bhawan, Khanpur, Ahmedabad.	Attorney High Court Bombay.	Gujarat and Maharashtra.	—
33.	Shri Halder Mirza.	Advocate, Phatak Sheikh Saleem, Varanasi (U.P.)	Advocate	Varanasi Division (U.P.)	—
34.	Shri Noor Mohammed.	Advocate, Udaipur (Rajasthan).	Advocate	Udaipur District.	—
35.	Shri Sudhir Kumar Seal.	C/o M/s. Sandersons & Morgans, Solicitors, Royal Insurance Bldgs. 5 & 7 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Solicitor	Whole of India.	—
36.	Shri Jitendra Nath Sanyal.	C/o M/s. Sandersons & Morgans, Solicitors, Royal Insurance Buildings 5 & 7 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Solicitor	Whole of India.	—
37.	Shri Indersen Israni.	Advocate, J-54 Krishna Marg, Jaipur, (Rajasthan).	Advocate	Jaipur City & District.	—
38.	Shri P.C. Kurian.	333, Thambu Chetty Street, Madras-1.	Advocate	Madras and Kerala.	—
39.	Shri Gurdyal Singh Sindho.	No. 1 Dekoha, Jullundur (Punjab).	Advocate	Jullundur District.	—
40.	Shri C.S. Venkatasubramanian.	140, Cross Cut Road, Coimbatore-12.	Advocate	Coimbatore District.	—
41.	Shri Pushkar Lal Juneja	F-2, Bhagat Singh Market, Lady Hardinge Road, New Delhi and F-1, Shankar Market, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.	Advocate	Whole of India.	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
42.	Shri Chuni Lal Bhatia.	C4A/68C, Janakpuri, New Delhi.	Advocate	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
43.	Shri Ramji Das Singal	Gurdwara Street, Bhatinda (Punjab)	Advocate	Bhatinda District	—
44.	Shri Deoraj Singh Tyagi.	Advocate, Collectorate's Courts, Bullandshahr (U.P.)	Advocate	District Bullandshahr (U.P.)	—
45.	Shri Bal Krishan	Advocate, Hanumangarh Town, District Ganganagar (Rajasthan).	Advocate	District Ganganagar with Headquarters at Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).	—
46.	Shri S.R. Mehta.	Advocate Balotra (Rajasthan).	Advocate	District of Barmer and Jalore with Headquarters at Balotra (Rajasthan).	—
47.	Shri D.D. Kakar	Advocate, 36/9, East Patel Nagar, New Delhi-8.	Advocate	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
48.	Shri G.C. Verma.	Advocate, Oath Commissioner E/12, Green Park, New Delhi.	Advocate-cum-Oath Commissioner	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
49.	Shri P.L. Gandhi.	Advocate, Opposite Gandhi Baug, Surat.	Advocate	Surat District	—
50.	Shri A.R. Malkani.	Advocate, BBZ-N-6, Gandhidham (Kutch).	Advocate	Anjar Taluka of Kutch District.	—
51.	Shri N.C. Shah.	C/o Khaitan & Co., Solicitors, 1B Old Post Office Street, Calcutta-1.	Advocate Calcutta	Calcutta and New Delhi.	—
52.	Shri T. Dulipsingh.	C/o Messrs King & Pertridge, 2nd Floor, Catholic Centre, Armenian Street, Post Box No. 121, Madras-1.	Advocate Madras	Whole of India	—
53.	Shri J.R. Gagrati.	C/o M/s., Gagrati & Company, Alli Chambers, Nagindas Master Road Fort Bombay-1.	Advocate Bombay	Whole of India	—
54.	Shri R. Setlur.	C/o Crawford Bayley & Co., State Bank Bldgs. Bank Street, Bombay-1.	Attorney and Advocate Bombay	Whole of India	—
55.	Shri Brij Mohan Mehta.	13A/2, Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi-7.	Advocate New Delhi	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
56.	Shri Nani Gopal Datta.	56/1, M.N. Sen Lane, Tollygunge, Distt. 24 Parganas, West Bengal.	Advocate Calcutta	District 24 Parganas Alipore Calcutta.	—
57.	Shri Surjit Singh	23, Netaji Park Jullundur City (Punjab).	Advocate Jullundur	Jullundur	—
58.	Shri Jagjit Singh Bains	376-L Model Town Jullundur City (Punjab)	Advocate Jullundur	Jullundur	—
59.	Shri K.J. Khambeta	Rajab Mahal, 144, Queens Road, Bombay-20.	Advocate, Bombay	Whole of India	—
60.	Shri Ambelal Bavabhai Patel	Vaidya Street, P.O. Navsari District Bular (Gujarat).	Advocate	Bular District (Gujarat).	—
61.	Shri Punamchand Somchand Shah	C/o Messrs Purnand and Co., Solicitors to Government of Gujarat 'Shrache' Haridas Colony, Navjiwan Press Road, Ahmedabad-14.	Advocate	Gujarat	—
62.	Shri Nawal S. Phatarphekar	C/o M/s Crawford Bayley & Co., State Bank Buildings Bank Street, Bombay.	Advocate & Attorney, Bombay High Court.	Whole of India	—
63.	Shri Jagan Nath	Moga District Faridkot (Punjab).	Advocate	Faridkot District.	—
64.	Shri B.T. Merchant	C/o Messrs Thakordas & Madgavkar, Fort Chambers, Dean Lane Fort, Bombay-400001.	Attorney & Advocate	Whole of India	—
65.	Shri Rustam R. Dadachanji	Dhun Building, 1st Floor, 23/25 Ghoga Street, Fort Bombay.	Advocate	Greater Bombay.	—
66.	Shri H.M. Bhagat	C/o Ambubhai & Diwaji, Lentin Chambers, Dalal, Street Fort, Bombay. AND C/o Ambubhai & Diwanji, Solicitors & Advocates, Bank of India Buildings, Ahmedabad-380001.	Advocate and Solicitor	Gujarat	—
67.	Shri H.V. Chhatrapati	C/o Messrs Bhaishanker Kanga & Girdharlal, Manekji Wadia Building, Bell Lane Fort, Bombay-400001. AND C/o Messrs Bhaisankar Kanga and Girdharlal, Gujarat Samachar Bhawan, Khanpur, Ahmedabad-380001.	Advocate and Solicitor	Gujarat	—
68.	Shri G.S. Vyas	35, Lavanuanagar Jivraj Park Road, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-7.	Advocate	Ahmedabad	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
69. Shri Amar Singh	Jamit Singh Road Moga, District Fridkot (Punjab).	Advocate	Moga Distt. Frid- kot (Punjab)	—	
70. Shri B.H. Antia	C/o Messrs Mulla & Mulla & Craigie Blunt & Caroe, Solicitors and No- taries, Jehangir Wadia Building, 51 Mahatama Gandhi Road, Bombay- 400001.	Attorney and Advocate	Greater Bombay	—	
71. Shri B.P. Shukla	Rugnath Building Opp. Town Hall Raj- kot (Gujarat).	Advocate	Rajkot and Junagadh District.	—	
72. Shri B.K. Shah	Banani Niwas Nani Chipwad, Baroda- 6.	Advocate	Baroda	—	
73. Shri Ramesh J. Mehta	Advocate, Nadiad (District) Kaira), Gujarat State.	Advocate	Kaira and Panchma- hals Districts.	—	
74. Shri Amar Chand Dutt	C/o Messrs Foler and Co., 12 Govern- ment Place, East, Calcutta-1.	Advocate	Calcutta	—	
75. Shri Vasantlal D. Mehta	C/o Malvi Ranchodas & Co., Solicitors and Advocates, Yusuf Building, Mahtama Gandhi Road, Fort Bombay-400001.	Solicitor	Maharashtra	—	
76. Shri G.V. Bhatt	C/o Bhatt & Saldanha Maker Bhavan, 1, New Marine Lines, Bombay-20.	Attorney & Advocate	Whole of India	—	
77. Shri Milawa Ram Kalia	33/16, Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi- 110005.	Advocate Punjab & High Court.	Unlon Territory of Delhi	—	
78. Shri Prakash Chand Jain	82, Khurbara Dehradun.	Advocate	Judgeship of West Uttarakhand (U.P.) Office at Dehra- dun.	—	
79. Shri Moiz F. Karmala- wala	Churchogate Chambers Solicitor 5, New Marine Lines, Room No. 611, 6th Floor Bombay-20 BR.	Solicitor	Whole of the State of Maharashtra with Hqr. at Bom- bay.	—	

[No. 22/1/76-Jus]

R. L. PARDEEP, Dy. Secy.

## गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 1976

कां०आ० 582.—केन्द्रीय सरकार अण्डमान और निकोबार द्वीप समूह भू-राजस्व और भूमि सुधार विनियम, 1966 (1966 का 2) की धारा 6 और धारा 46 की उपधारा (1) में अंतर्निष्ठ उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में निम्न रूप में नियुक्तियाँ पदमुक्तियाँ करती है :—

1. श्री रमेश चन्द्र ने अण्डमान और निकोबार द्वीपसमूह जिला के उपायुक्त के पद का कार्यभार 4 सितम्बर, 1974 के अपराह्न से त्याग दिया है।
2. श्री ओ० एस० चौहान ने प्रायुक्त और बन्दोबस्त प्रायुक्त के पद का कार्यभार 9 सितम्बर 1974 के पूर्वाह्न से सम्भाला और 21 अप्रैल, 1975 के पूर्वाह्न से उसे त्याग दिया है।
3. श्री एस सी० बोहरा ने निकोबार जिला के उपायुक्त के पद का कार्यभार 8 अगस्त, 1974 के पूर्वाह्न से सम्भाल लिया है।
4. श्री ओ० सी० चव्हाण 24-4-75 से छुट्टी पर गए हैं और उसी तारीख से उपायुक्त और बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी, अण्डमान जिला के पद का कार्यभार त्याग दिया है।
5. श्री के० सेतुराम ने अरर जिला मजिस्ट्रेट ने, अपने कर्तव्यों के अतिरिक्त 21 अप्रैल, 1975 के पूर्वाह्न उपायुक्त और बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी, अण्डमान जिला के पद का पूर्ण कार्यभार सम्भाला तथा 7 मई, 1975 पूर्वाह्न से उसे त्याग दिया है।
6. श्री लछमन सिंह ने श्री एस० सी० बोरा के, जो 8-5-75 से छुट्टी पर गए हैं, स्थान पर 10 मई, 1975 के पूर्वाह्न से अपने कर्तव्यों के अतिरिक्त उपायुक्त जिला के पद का पूर्ण कार्यभार संभाल लिया है।

7. श्री ओ० एस० चव्हाण ने मई, 7 1975 के पूर्वाह्न से उपायुक्त और बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी, अण्डमान जिला के पद का कार्यभार सम्भाल लिया है।
8. श्री लछमन सिंह ने 9 जुलाई, 1975 के पूर्वाह्न से उपायुक्त निकोबार जिला के पद का कार्यभार त्याग दिया है।
9. श्री मतेपुरकर, शिक्षा अधिकारी, निकोबार ने 9 जुलाई, 1975 के पूर्वाह्न से अपने कर्तव्यों के अतिरिक्त उपायुक्त निकोबार जिला के पद का कार्यभार सम्भाला और 17 जुलाई, 1975 के अपराह्न से उसे त्याग दिया है।
10. श्री सनत कौल ने 17 जुलाई, 1975 के अपराह्न से नियमित आधार पर उपायुक्त निकोबार जिला के पद का कार्यभार सम्भाल लिया है।

[संख्या यू०-140161/15/75-ए० एन० एल०]

कैलाश प्रकाश, उप सचिव।

## MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 16th January, 1976

S.O. 582.—In pursuance of the provisions contained in section 6 and sub-section (1) of Section 46 of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Land Revenue and Land Reforms Regulation, 1966 (2 of 1966), the Central Government hereby makes the appointments/relinquishments as under :—

1. Shri Ramesh Chandra relinquished the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner of the District of Andaman & Nicobar Islands with effect from the after-noon of the 4th September, 1974.

2. Shri O. S. Chauhan assumed charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner and Settlement Commissioner from the forenoon of the 9th September, 1974 and relinquished the same from the forenoon of 21st April, 1975.

3. Shri S. C. Borah assumed the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner of the District of Nicobar from the forenoon of the 6th August, 1974.

4. Shri O. S. Chauhan proceeded on leave w.e.f. 21-4-1975 and relinquished the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner and Settlement Officer, Andamans District with effect from the same date.

5. Shri K. Sethuraman, Additional District Magistrate in addition to his own duties, assumed full charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner and Settlement Officer, Andaman District with effect from the forenoon of the 21st April, 1975 and relinquished the same with effect from the 7th May, 1975 (forenoon).

6. Shri Lachman Singh held full charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner District in addition to his own duties with effect from the forenoon of the 10th May, 1975 vice Shri S. C. Borah proceeded on leave with effect from 8-5-75.

7. Shri O.S. Chauhan assumed the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner and Settlement Officer, Andaman District the forenoon of the 7th May, 1975.

8. Shri Lachman Singh relinquished the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner, Nicobar District with effect from the forenoon of the 9th July, 1975.

9. Shri Matepurkar, Medical Officer, Car Nicobar in addition to his own duties assumed the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner, Nicobar District with effect from the forenoon of the 9th July, 1975, and relinquished the same from the afternoon of the 17th July, 1975.

10. Shri Sanat Kaul assumed the charge of the post of Deputy Commissioner, Nicobar District, on regular basis from the afternoon of the 17th July, 1975.

[No. U. 14016/15/75-ANL]

KAILASH PRAKASH, Dy. Secy.

### वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 नवम्बर, 1975

आय-कर

क्रा० प्र० 583.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संस्था को विहित प्राधिकारी, भारतीय समाज विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद् द्वारा आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अनुमोदित किया गया है। संस्था, जैसा कि तय पाया गया है इस धारा के अधीन प्राप्त अनुदानों और वानों का पृथक लेखा रखेगी और इन क्रिया कलापों के लेखों का एक वार्षिक विवरण भारतीय समाज विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद् को भेजेगी

संस्था

भारतीय समाज कल्याण परिषद्, मुम्बई

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1975 से प्रभावी है।

[सं० 1153 (क्रा० सं० 203/157/75 आ० क० अ० II)]

टी० पी० मूनमूनवाला, उप-सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue & Insurance)

New Delhi, the 19th November, 1975

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 583.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Social Science Research; the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1)

of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961. The institution shall, as agreed to, maintain a separate account for the grants and donations received under this Section and render an annual statement of accounts of these activities to the Indian Council of Social Science Research.

### INSTITUTION

The Indian Council of Social Welfare, Bombay.

The notification takes effect from 1st April, 1975.

[No. 1153 (F. No. 203/157/75-ITA. II)]

T. P. JHUNJHUNWALA, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1976

### CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 584.—In the notification No. 1148 (F. No. 404/169/75-ITCC) dated the 10th November, 1975 of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue & Insurance) published in Part II Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India, for the names "S. D. Mohanty" and "J. K. Sarkar" read "S. C. Mohanty" and "T. K. Sarkar".

[No. 1203 (F. No. 404/169/75 ITCC)]

V. P. MITTAL, Dy. Secy.

### (बैंकिंग विभाग)

(नई दिल्ली, 7 जनवरी, 1976)

क्रा० प्र० 585.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उपर्युक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध 'ब' बरेली कार्पोरेशन (बैंक) लि०' बरेली पर, उसके द्वारा फर्रुखाबाद में धृत भवन सम्पत्ति के संबंध में 13 दिसम्बर 1976 तक लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं० 15(5)-बी० प्र० III/75]

मे० भा० उसगांवकर, अवसर सचिव,

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 7th January, 1976

S.O. 585.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Bareilly Corporation (Bank) Ltd., Bareilly till the 13th December 1976 in respect of the house property held by it at Farrukhabad.

[No. 15(5)-B.O. III/75]

M. B. USGAONKAR, Under Secy.

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जनवरी, 1976

सीमा-शुल्क

क्रा० प्र० 586.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 7 के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व और

बीमा विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० 75/75, तारीख 3 जुलाई, 1975 (12 आषाढ़, 1897 शक) में, निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, विद्यमान सारणी के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित सारणी रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्—

सारणी		
क्रम सं०	विमान पत्तन	प्रयोजन
1	2	3
1. अहमदाबाद	(क) आयातित माल, अर्थात् कोरे बहुमूल्य और अल्पमूल्य रत्नों का उतारा जाना और	
	(ख) निम्नलिखित निर्यात माल का लदान, अर्थात्—	
	(i) हस्तशिल्प, जिसमें हथकरघा और रेशम की बनी वस्तुएं सम्मिलित हैं,	
	(ii) बहुमूल्य और अल्पमूल्य कठित रत्न (कट स्टोन)	
	(iii) बहुमूल्य और अल्पमूल्य रत्न जटित आभूषण सैट,	
	(iv) तैयार वस्त्र,	
	(v) इंजीनियरी माल,	
	(vi) रसायन और भेषज,	
	(vii) इलेक्ट्रॉनिक माल।	
2. जयपुर	(क) आयातित माल, अर्थात् कोरे बहुमूल्य और अल्पमूल्य रत्नों का उतारा जाना और	
	(ख) निम्नलिखित निर्यात माल का लदान अर्थात्—	
	(i) हस्त शिल्प, जिसमें हथकरघा और रेशम की बनी वस्तुएं सम्मिलित हैं।	
	(ii) बहुमूल्य और अल्पमूल्य कठित रत्न (कट स्टोन) और	
	(iii) बहुमूल्य और अल्पमूल्य रत्न जटित आभूषण सैट।	
3. श्री नगर और वाराणसी	निर्यात माल का अर्थात्, हस्तशिल्प, जिसमें हथकरघा और रेशम की बनी वस्तुएं सम्मिलित हैं, लदान।	
4. बंगलौर	निम्नलिखित निर्यात माल का लदान अर्थात्—	
	(i) हस्त शिल्प, जिसमें हथकरघा और रेशम की बनी वस्तुएं सम्मिलित हैं,	
	(ii) जन्वन का तेल,	
	(iii) अगरर बत्तियां,	
	(iv) दूर संचार उपकरण,	
	(v) इलेक्ट्रॉनिक माल,	
	(vi) मशीनी औजार, फालतू पुर्जे और उपसाधन,	
	(vii) कलाई-थडियां,	

(viii) स्पाई प्लग, फ्यूल इंजेक्शन उपस्कर और उसके पुर्जे,

(ix) वैमानिक उपस्कर और

(x) प्रैणर ट्रांसड्यूसर।

[सं० 4 सीमा-शुल्क का० सं० 481/23/75-सीमा-शुल्क-7]

यू० के० सेन, अवर सचिव

(Department of Revenue and Insurance)

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1976

### CUSTOMS

S.O. 586.—n exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of section 7 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. 75/75 dated the 3rd July, 1975 (12th Asadha, 1897 Saka), namely :—

In the said notification, for the Table, the following Table shall be substituted, namely :—

"TABLE

S. No.	Airports	Purposes
1.	2.	3.
1. Ahmedabad	(a) The unloading of imported goods, namely, rough precious and semi-precious stones ; and	
	(b) the loading of export goods, namely :—	
	(i) handicrafts, including handloom and silk manufactures,	
	(ii) cut precious and semi-precious stones,	
	(iii) Jewellery set with precious and semi-precious stones,	
	(iv) readymade garments,	
	(v) engineering goods,	
	(vi) chemicals and pharmaceuticals, and	
	(vii) electronic goods.	
2. Jaipur	(a) The unloading of imported goods, namely, rough precious and semi-precious stones ; and	
	(b) the loading of export goods, namely :—	
	(i) handicrafts, including handloom and silk manufactures,	
	(ii) cut precious and semi-precious stones, and	
	(iii) jewellery set with precious and semi-precious stones.	
3. Srinagar and Varanasi	The loading of export goods, namely, handicrafts, including handloom and silk manufactures.	
4. Bangalore	The loading of export goods, namely :—	
	(i) handicrafts, including handloom and silk manufactures,	
	(ii) Sandalwood oil,	
	(iii) Agarbatties,	
	(iv) Telecommunications equipment,	



1	2	3
		(v) Electronic goods,
		(vi) Machine tools, spare parts and accessories,
		(vii) Wrist Watches,
		(viii) Spark plugs, fuel injection equipment and parts thereof,
		(ix) Aeronautical equipment, and
		(x) Pressure Transducers."

[No. 4 Cus./F.No.481/23/75-Cus. VII]

U. K. SEN, Under Secy.

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 29 जनवरी, 1976 -

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 587.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 1) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उम शुल्क से, जो 11 जुलाई 1975 को मद्रास में अग्नि-वृधत्ता में नष्ट जीवन बीमा पॉलिसियों के स्थान पर भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम द्वारा निष्पादित की जाने वाली जीवन बीमा पॉलिसियों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रभाय है, छूट देती है।

[सं० 4/76-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/88/75-सीमा शुल्क-7]

ORDER

STAMPS

New Delhi, the 29th January, 1976

S.O. 587.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the stamp duty with which the life insurance policies to be executed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the place of life insurance policies destroyed by fire accident in Madras on 11th July, 1975, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 4/76-Stamps/F. No. 471/88/75-Cus. VII]

प्रादेश

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 588.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उम शुल्क से, जो तमिलनाडु विद्युत बोर्ड द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले आठ करोड़ अस्सी लाख रुपए मूल्य के वचनपत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रभाय है, छूट देती है।

[सं० 5/76-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/89/75-सीमा शुल्क-7]

ORDER

STAMPS

S.O. 588.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the promissory notes to the value of eight crores and eighty lakhs of rupees, to be issued by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 5/76-Stamps/F. No.471/89/75-Cus.-VII]

138 GI/75--3.

प्रादेश

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 589.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 1) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उम शुल्क से, जो केरल वित्तीय निगम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले पैंनालीय लाख रुपए मूल्य के वचन पत्रों के रूप में तदर्थ बन्ध पत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रभाय है, छूट देती है।

[सं० 6/76-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/95/75-सीमा-शुल्क-7]

ORDER

STAMPS

S.O. 589.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the ad hoc bonds in the form of promissory notes to the value of forty-five lakhs of rupees, to be issued by the Kerala Financial Corporation, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 6/76-Stamps/F. No.471/95/75-Cus.-VII]

प्रादेश

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 590.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय औद्योगिक विकास बैंक, मुम्बई द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले छह करोड़ और पचास लाख रुपये अंकित मूल्य के वचनपत्रों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क मध्ये प्रभाय नौ लाख और नब्बे हजार रुपये मात्र समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क का संदाय करने की उक्त औद्योगिक विकास बैंक को अनुज्ञा देती है।

[सं० 7/76-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/97/75-सी० शु०-7]

ORDER

STAMPS

S.O. 590.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Industrial Development Bank of India, Bombay, to pay consolidated stamp duty of nine lakhs and ninety thousand rupees only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of promissory notes of the face value of sixteen crores and fifty lakhs of rupees to be issued by the said Industrial Development Bank.

[No. 7/76-Stamps/F. No. 471/97/75-Cus.-VII]

प्रादेश

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 591.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उम शुल्क से, जो वचन पत्रों के रूप में इन्डस्ट्रियल रिकंस्ट्रक्शन कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले दो करोड़ और पचहत्तर लाख रुपए मूल्य के 6 प्रतिशत 10 वर्षीय बन्ध-पत्र 1985 पर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रभाय है, छूट देती है।

[सं० 8/76-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/98/75-सी० शु०-7]

जी० के० आचार्य, अवर सचिव

ORDER

STAMPS

S.O. 591.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (i) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act,

1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the 6 per cent 10 years Bonds, 1985 of the value of two crores and seventy five lakhs of rupees to be issued by the Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India Limited, Calcutta, in the form of promissory notes, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 8/76-Stamp/F. No. 471/98/75-Cus. VII]

D. K. ACHARYA, Under Secy.

#### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 फरवरी, 1976

का०आ० 592.—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने, जिन्हें विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेषरूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3(1) के अधीन आदेश एफ सं० 673/280/75 सीमा शुल्क-VIII, तारीख 3 दिसम्बर, 1975 को जारी किया था जिसमें निदेश दिया था कि श्री बलार्ड चन्द डे उर्फ जी. सी. डे., 10/1, गोपाल डाक्टर रोड, कलकत्ता-23 को विदेशी मुद्रा के संवर्धन के प्रतिकूल किसी भी रीति से कार्य करने से निवारित करने की वृष्टि से, प्रेसीडेंसी/कारागार, कलकत्ता में निरुद्ध किया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ; और

केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि उपरोक्त व्यक्ति, इस उद्देश्य से कि आदेश का निष्पादन न हो सके, फरार हो गया है या स्वयं को छिपाए हुए है ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 की धारा 7 (1) (ख) के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपरोक्त व्यक्ति को निदेश करती है कि वह उपायुक्त गुप्तचर विभाग, लाल बाजार, कलकत्ता के समक्ष इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर हाज़िर हो ।

[सं० 673/280/75 सीमा-शुल्क-8]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd February, 1976

S.O. 592.—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 issued order F. No. 673/280/75-Cus. VIII dated 3-12-1975 under section 3(1) ibid directing that Shri Bala Chand Dey @ B. C. Dey, 10/1 Gopal Doctor Road, Calcutta-23 be detained and kept in custody in the Presidency Jail, Calcutta with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the augmentation of foreign exchange; and

Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed.

The Central Government in exercise of powers under section 7(1) (b) of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 hereby direct the aforesaid person to appear before the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Detective Deptt., Lal Bazar, Calcutta within 7 days of the publication of this order in official gazette.

[F. No. 673/280/75-Cus.VIII]

#### आदेश

का०आ० 593.—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने, जिन्हें विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 3 (1) के अधीन आदेश एफ सं० 673/346/75

सी० शुल्क VIII, तारीख 30 अक्तूबर, 1975 को जारी किया था (जिसमें निदेश दिया था कि श्री कीथ मर्फी उर्फ जेम्स हावर्ड शर्मन उर्फ गैरी रिजिनल हैलीडे, फ्लैट नं० वी. 5, पांचवीं मंजिल, सी बीच, जुहू, मुम्बई-400054 को विदेशी मुद्रा के संवर्धन के प्रतिकूल किसी भी रीति से कार्य करने से निवारित करने की वृष्टि से, केन्द्रीय कारागार, नासिक रोड में निरुद्ध किया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ; और

केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि उपरोक्त व्यक्ति, इस उद्देश्य से कि आदेश का निष्पादन न हो सके, फरार हो गया है या स्वयं को छिपाए हुए है ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 की धारा 7 (1) (ख) के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपरोक्त व्यक्ति को निदेश करती है कि वह पुनः उपायुक्त ग्रेटर मुम्बई, के समक्ष इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर हाज़िर हो ।

[सं० 673/346/75 सी० शु० 8]

#### ORDER

S.O. 593.—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 issued order F. No. 673/346/75-Cus.VIII dated 30-10-1975 under section 3(1) ibid directing that Shri Keith Murphy @ James Howard Sharmen @ Garry Redginal Halliday, Flat No. B-5, 5th Floor, Sea Beach Jahu, Bombay-400054 be detained and kept in custody in the Nasik Road, Central Prison, Nasik Maharashtra with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the augmentation of foreign exchange; and

Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed.

The Central Government in exercise of power under section 7(1) (b) of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 hereby direct the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Greater Bombay within 7 days of the publication of this order in official gazette.

[F. No. 673/346/75-Cus.VIII]

#### आदेश

का०आ० 594.—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने, जिन्हें विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेषरूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 3(1) के अधीन आदेश एफ सं० 673/356/75 सीमा शुल्क - VIII, तारीख 14-11-1975 को जारी किया था जिसमें निदेश दिया था कि श्री राबर्ट पुल श्री साहप्रियन पिरैरा जो सरदार नगर सं० 1 चाल सं० 15 कमरा सं० 115 जिसे मुनिसिपल कैम्प चाल सं० 15, कमरा सं० 115 भी कहा जाता है गियोन, कोलीबाड़ा, मुम्बई-400022 में रहते हैं, को विदेशी मुद्रा के संवर्धन के प्रतिकूल किसी भी रीति से कार्य करने से निवारित करने की वृष्टि से, केन्द्रीय कारागार, नासिक, महाराष्ट्र में निरुद्ध किया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ; और

केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि उपरोक्त व्यक्ति, इस उद्देश्य से कि आदेश का निष्पादन न हो सके, फरार हो गया है या स्वयं को छिपाए हुए है ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 की धारा 7(1)(ख) के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपरोक्त व्यक्ति को निदेश करती है कि वह पुलिस आयुक्त ग्रेटर मुम्बई, के समक्ष इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर हाजिर हो।

[सं० 673/356/75-सी० शु० VIII]

# ORDER

**S.O. 594.**—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 issued order F. No. 673/356/75-Cus. VIII dated 14-11-1975 under section 3(1) ibid., directing that Shri Robert, S/o Shri Cyprian Pereira, residing at Sardar Nagar No. 1 Chawl No. 15, R. No. 115, also known as Municipal Camp, Chawl No. 15, Room No. 115, Sion, Koliwada, Bombay-400022 be detained and kept in custody in the Nasik Road Central Prison, Nasik, Maharashtra with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the augmentation of foreign exchange; and

Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed.

The Central Government in exercise of powers under Section 7(1) (b) of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 hereby direct the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Greater Bombay within 7 days of the publication of this order in Official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/356/75-Cus.VIII]

## आदेश

**का० प्रा० 595.**—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने, जिन्हें विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 (1) के अधीन आदेश एफ० सं० 673/363/75 सी० शु० VIII, तारीख 3 दिसम्बर, 1975 को जारी किया था जिसमें निदेश दिया था कि राम मूर्ति मणि तिवारी उर्फ राम मूर्ति तिवारी मेमर्स तिवारी ट्रेवल एजेंसी 30/31 कलाकार स्ट्रीट कमरा नं. 24 और 25 चौधी मंजिल, कलकत्ता को विदेशी मुद्रा के संवर्धन के प्रतिकूल किसी भी

रीति से कार्य करने से निवारित करने की दृष्टि से, प्रेसीडेसी/कारागार, कलकत्ता में निरुद्ध किया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए; और

केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि उपरोक्त व्यक्ति, इस उद्देश्य से कि आदेश का निष्पादन न हो सके, फरार हो गया है या स्वयं को छिपाए हुए है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 की धारा 7(1)(ख) के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपरोक्त व्यक्ति को निदेश करती है कि वह पुलिस उपायुक्त गुप्तचर विभाग, लाल बाजार, कलकत्ता के समक्ष इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर हाजिर हो।

[सं० 673/363/75-सी० शु० VIII]

सुरजीत सिंह, उप-सचिव

# ORDER

**S.O. 595.**—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 issued order F. No. 673/363/75-Cus. VIII dated 3-12-1975 under section 3(1) ibid., directing that Shri Ram Murti Mani Tiwari @ Ram Murti Tiwari, M/s. Tiwari Travel Agency, 30/31 Kalakar Street, R. Nos. 24 and 25, 4th Floor, Calcutta be detained and kept in custody in the Presidency Jail, Calcutta with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the augmentation of foreign exchange; and

Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed.

The Central Government in exercise of powers under section 7(1)(b) of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 hereby direct the aforesaid person to appear before the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Detective Department, Lal Bazar, Calcutta within 7 days of the publication of this order in Official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/363/75-Cus.VIII]

SURJIT SINGH, Deputy, Secy.

## (बैंकिंग विभाग)

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1976

**का० प्रा० 596.**—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जनवरी, 1976 के दिनांक 9 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

## दृश्य विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	18,42,52,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
			(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,52,51,000	
संचयन में नोट	63,85,26,63,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
जारी किये गए कुल नोट		64,03,69,15,000	विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां जोड़	121,73,97,000	304,26,48,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		14,01,66,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां		6085,41,01,000
			वैदेशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे बाणिज्य-पत्र		
कुल देयताएं		6403,69,15,000	कुल आस्तियां		6403,69,15,000

दिनांक: 15 जनवरी, 1976।

आर० के० हजारी, उप-गवर्नर

## 9 जनवरी, 1976 को भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
शुक्ता पूंजी . . . . .	5,00,00,000	नोट . . . . .	18,42,52,000
आरक्षित निधि . . . . .	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का . . . . .	3,07,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण . . . . .		छोटा सिक्का . . . . .	4,67,000
(दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि . . . . .	334,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल . . . . .	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण . . . . .		(क) देशी . . . . .	172,80,10,000
(स्थिरीकरण) निधि . . . . .	140,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी . . . . .	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण . . . . .		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल . . . . .	288,77,80,000
(दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि . . . . .	390,00,00,000	विदेशी में रखा हुआ धुआँ बकाया** . . . . .	699,86,66,000
जमा राशियां :—		निवेश** . . . . .	686,81,79,000
(क) सरकारी . . . . .		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(1) केन्द्रीय सरकार . . . . .	53,27,44,000	(1) केन्द्रीय सरकार को . . . . .	..
(2) राज्य सरकारों . . . . .	4,77,62,000	(2) राज्य सरकारों को† . . . . .	162,15,56,000
(ख) बैंक . . . . .		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(1) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक . . . . .	610,36,28,000	(1) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को† . . . . .	534,80,35,000
(2) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	23,29,75,000	(2) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को†† . . . . .	407,28,31,000
(3) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	1,62,03,000	(3) दूसरों को . . . . .	15,56,50,000
(4) अन्य बैंक . . . . .	71,51,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश . . . . .	
(ग) अन्य . . . . .	1417,16,51,000	(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
वेय बिल . . . . .	137,09,62,000	(1) राज्य सरकारों को . . . . .	69,55,57,000
अन्य देयताएं . . . . .	848,11,41,000	(2) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को . . . . .	15,94,34,000
		(3) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को . . . . .	..
		(4) कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम को . . . . .	86,70,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश . . . . .	10,16,66,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	93,60,69,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश . . . . .	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	348,77,03,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किए गए बांडों/ डिबेंचरों में निवेश . . . . .	..
		अन्य आस्तियां . . . . .	504,10,55,000
	रुपये 4115,42,17,000	रुपये 4115,42,17,000	

\* तकदी, आवश्यक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

\*\* राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि में से किए गए निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिए गए अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

† भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीमादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 100,77,50,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

†† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

भार० के० हजारी, उपगवर्नर  
[सं० फ० 10(1)/76-बी०ओ० I]

चि० व० गोरचन्दानी, अवर गनिव

## (Banking Department)

## RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1976

S. O. 596.—An Account Pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934 for the week ended the 9th day of January, 1976

## ISSUE DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department . . . . .	18,42,52,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—	
Notes in circulation . . . . .	6385,26,63,000		(a) Held in India . . . . .	182,52,51,000
			(b) Held outside India . . . . .	..
Total notes issued . . . . .		6403,69,15,000	Foreign Securities . . . . .	121,73,97,000
			Total . . . . .	304,26,48,000
			Rupee Coin . . . . .	14,01,66,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .	6085,41,01,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper . . . . .	..
Total Liabilities . . . . .		6403,69,15,000	Total Assets . . . . .	6403,69,15,000

Dated the 15th day of January, 1976

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 9th January, 1976

Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Capital Paid Up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes	18,42,52,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin . . . . .	3,07,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	334,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .	4,67,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	140,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	390,00,00,000	(a) Internal . . . . .	172,80,10,000
		(b) External . . . . .	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	288,77,80,000
		Balances Held Abroad** . . . . .	699,86,66,000
		Investments** . . . . .	686,81,79,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) Central Government . . . . .	..
		(ii) State Governments@ . . . . .	162,15,56,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .	534,80,35,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡ . . . . .	407,28,31,000
		(iii) Others . . . . .	15,56,50,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	
		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) State Governments . . . . .	69,55,57,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	15,94,34,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	..
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation . . . . .	..
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures . . . . .	86,70,00,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	10,16,66,000
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	93,60,69,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	348,77,03,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	..
		Other Assets . . . . .	504,10,55,000
RUPEES . . . . .	4115,42,17,000	RUPEES . . . . .	4115,42,17,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@ Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 100,77,50,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under section 17(4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

[No. F.10(1)/76-B.O.I.]

Dated the 15th day of January, 1976

W. C. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

## केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्षकर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 1975

(आयकर)

क्रा० आ० 597.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्षकर बोर्ड अधिसूचना सं० 1090 [क्रा० सं० 187/2/74 आई० टी० (ए० आई०)] तारीख 20-9-1975 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है, अर्थात्:—

क्रम सं० 23घ और 23 छ के सामने स्तंभ 1, 2 और 3 के अधीन विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी।

आयकर आयुक्त	मुख्यालय	अधिकारिता
23घ पश्चिमी बंगाल-V	कलकत्ता	1. जूट सर्किल, कलकत्ता 2. कम्पनी जिला 5 कलकत्ता 3. कोऑपरेटिव सर्किल, कलकत्ता 4. विदेश कम्पनी सर्किल, कलकत्ता 5. विशेष अन्वेषण, सर्किल 1 कलकत्ता
23छ पश्चिमी बंगाल-VII	कलकत्ता	1. जिला II (2) कलकत्ता 2. जिला III (2) कलकत्ता 3. परियोजना सर्किल, कलकत्ता

यह अधिसूचना 1-10-75 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 1101 (क्रा० सं० 187/2/74-आई० टी० (ए० आई०))]  
टी० पी० ज़ुनज़ुनवाला, सचिव

## CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 26th September, 1975

## (INCOME-TAX)

S. O. 597.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Notification No. 1090 [F.No. 187/2/74-IT(AI)] dated 20-9-75.

The entries under columns 1, 2 & 3 against Sl. No. 23D and 23G shall be substituted by the following entries:—

Commissioner of Income Tax	Headquarters	Jurisdiction
23D West Bengal-V.	Calcutta	1. Jute Circle, Calcutta. 2. Comp. Dist. V, Calcutta. 3. Co-operative Circle, Calcutta. 4. Foreign Companies Circles, Calcutta. 5. Special Investigation Cir-I, Calcutta.
23G West Bengal-VIII	Calcutta	1. Dist. II (2) Calcutta. 2. Dist. III (2) Calcutta. 3. Project Cri. Calcutta.

This notification shall take effect from 1-10-75.

[F. No. 187/2/74-IT(AI)]  
T. P. JHUNJHUNWALA, Secy.

## वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 1976

क्रा० आ० 598.—सर्वश्री विशालान्ध्र विगनान समिति, मच्छावरम, विजयवाड़ा-4 को 9,858/- रुपये (नौ हजार आठ सौ अठ्ठावन रुपये मात्र) के लिये एक आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/ए/1406738/सी/एक्स एक्स/54/एच/39-40, दिनांक 10-3-75 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई। आगे यह बताया गया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति का उपयोग नहीं किया गया था। इसका उपयोग कुछ नहीं किया गया था और इस पर शेष उपलब्ध 9858 रुपये था।

2. आवेदक ने इस तर्क के समर्थन में एक भपथपत्र श्री ए० एस० रामराव आन्ध्र प्रदेश विजयवाड़ा के नोटरी के प्रमाणपत्र के साथ दाखिल किया है। मैं तदनुसार संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है। इसलिए यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की उपधारा 9 (सीसी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर सर्वश्री विशालान्ध्र विगनान समिति, विजयवाड़ा को जारी की गई उक्त लाइसेंस संख्या : पी/ए/1406738/सी/एक्स एक्स/54/एच/39-40, दिनांक 10-3-75 की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति को एतद्द्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

3. उक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुरूपि प्रति लाइसेंसदारी को अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या 115.5/5-3/74-75/एन पी एस]  
एन० सी० कांजीलाल, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports &amp; Exports)

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th January, 1976

S.O. 598.—M/s. Visalaandhra Vignana Samithi, Machavaram, Vijayawada-4 were granted an import licence No. P/A/1406738/C/XX/54/H/39-40 dated 10-3-75 for Rs. 9858 (Rupees Nine thousand eight hundred & fifty eight only). They have applied for the issue of a duplicate Exchange Control Purposes copy of the said licence on the ground that the original Exchange Control Purposes copy of licence No. P/ placed. It is further stated that the original Exchange Control copy was unutilised. It was utilised for Rs. Nil and the balance available on it was Rs. 9858/-.

2. In support of this contention the applicant has filed an affidavit along with a certificate from Shri A. S. Rama Rao Notary for Andhra Pradesh, Vijayawada. I am accordingly satisfied that the original/Exchange Control Purposes copy of the said licence has been lost. Therefore in exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(cc) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended the said original Exchange Control Purposes copy of licence No. P/A/1406738/C/XX/54/H/39-40 dated 10-3-75 issued to M/s. Visalaandhra Vignana Samithi, Vijayawada hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Exchange Control Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued separately to the licensee.

[No. 115. V/V-3/74-75/NPS]  
N. C. KANJILAL, Dy. Chief Controller

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

(केंद्रीय लाइसेंस क्षेत्र)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 अक्टूबर, 1975

का० आ० 599.—सर्वश्री विष्को इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स, बन्मल स्ट्रीट, कोटकपुरा को (1) थर्मिस्टर्स (2) फेरिट्स (3) सेल्फ बाइंडिंग कापर वायर और (4) प्लास्टिक फिल्म और टेप (1000 वोल्ट और इससे ऊपर ब्रेक डाउन के लिए) का आयात करने के लिए 30,000 रुपये के लिए लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1810641 दिनांक 26-10-74, 30,000 रुपये के लिए, लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1772741 दिनांक 31-3-75 और 18,000 रुपये के लिए लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1772742 दिनांक 31-3-75 प्रदान किये गये थे। उन्होंने लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1810641 दिनांक 26-10-74 की बिना उपयोग किये हुए 4,218 रुपये के लिए और लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1772741 दिनांक 31-3-75 की बिना उपयोग किए 30,000 के लिये सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अनुमिति प्रति के लिए और लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1772742 दिनांक 31-3-75 की बिना उपयोग किए गए 18,000 रुपये के लिए मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण की अनुमिति प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि इनकी मूल प्रतियां खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं। जहां तक लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1810641 दिनांक 26-10-74 का संबंध है, उसका पूरा पूरा उपयोग नहीं किया गया है। दूसरे दोनों लाइसेंसों का बिल्कुल ही उपयोग नहीं किया गया है। किसी भी सीमाशुल्क पत्तन पर पंजीकृत नहीं कराये गये हैं।

लाइसेंसधारी ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम और क्रियाविधि पुस्तक, 1975-76 के पैरा 320 के अनुसार अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में स्टाम्प कागज पर एक सपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1810641 दिनांक 26-10-74 और पी/एस/1772741 दिनांक 31-3-75 की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियां और लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1772742 दिनांक 31-3-75 की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं।

अब तक यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं निम्नांकित अनुसार लाइसेंसों को रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

(1) पी/एस/1810641 दिनांक 26-10-74 (सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति बिना उपयोग किए हुए 4218 रुपये मात्र के लिए)।

(2) पी/एस/1772741 दिनांक 31-3-75 (सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति मात्र)

(3) पी/एस/1772742 दिनांक 31-3-75 (मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति मात्र)

अब उपर्युक्त विवरण के अनुसार आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण, नियम और क्रियाविधि पुस्तक, 1975-76 के पैरा 320 के अनुसार उक्त लाइसेंसों की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियां और मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुमिति प्रतियों को जारी करने के लिए विचार किया जायेगा।

[मं० एन० पी०/बी-4/एन०/एस० 74-ए० यु० पी० बी०/सी० एल० ए०/2233]

के० एन० कपूर, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक।

आयात-निर्यात कृते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात निर्यात

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th October, 1975

S.O. 599.—M/s. Vibco Electronics, Bansal Street, Kotkapura, were granted import licences No. P/S/1810641 dated 26-10-74 for Rs. 30,000. P/S/1772741 dated 31-3-75 for Rs. 30,000 & P/S/1772742 dated 31-3-75 for Rs. 18,000 for import of (1) Thermistors, (2) Ferrites, (3) Self Bonding Copper Wire & (4) Plastic Film & Tape (for 1000 Volt and above break down). They have applied for duplicate Customs purpose copy of licence No. P/S/1810641 dated 26-10-74 to the extent of un-utilized value of Rs. 4,218, & licence No. P/S/1772741 dated 31-3-75 to the extent of un-utilized value of Rs. 30,000 and Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/S/1772742 dated 31-3-75 to the extent of un-utilized value of Rs. 18,000 on the ground that original copies have been lost/misplaced without having been utilized fully, so far as licence No. P/S/1810641 dated 26-10-74 is concerned. The other two licences have not been utilized at all/registered at any port.

The licence has filed an affidavit on statement paper in support of their contention as required under para 320 of I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules & Procedure 1975-76. I am satisfied that original Customs purposes copies of licences No. P/S/1810641 dated 26-10-74 & P/S/1772741 dated 31-3-75 and Exchange Control copy of licence No. P/S/1772742 dated 31-3-75 have been lost/misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under clause 9(cc) Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55, as amended upto date, I order the cancellation of the licences as under :—

(i) P/S/1810641 dated 26-10-74 (Customs copy only to the extent of un-utilised value Rs. 4,218).

(ii) P/S/1772741 dated 31-3-75 (Custom copy only).

(iii) P/S/1772742 dated 31-3-75 (Exchange control copy only).

The licensees case will now be considered for the issue of duplicate customs purpose copies & Exchange control copy of the above licences as above in accordance with para 320 of I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules & Procedure—1975-76.

[File No. NP/V-4/N/AM-74/AU.PB./CLA/2233]  
Sd/-

K. N. KAPOOR, Dy. Chief Controller

of Imports & Exports.

for Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

आदेश

उप मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय, बंगलौर

बंगलौर, 24 नवम्बर, 1975

का० आ० 600.—सर्वश्री मैसूर पेट्रोल प्रगल्भी वर्क्स पी० बी० न० 1705 गौरी पल-यम, बंगलौर की एरोमेटिक रसायन, प्राकृतिक सुगंधित तेल एवं रेजिन-नयाड्स के आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1827513/आर.एम.एस/47/एक्स 35-36 दिनांक 6-6-1973 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुमिति सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति किसी भी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराए बिना और उस का बिल्कुल उपयोग किये बिना ही खो गई है और अब लाइसेंस की अनुमिति प्रति की आवश्यकता लाइसेंस के पूरे मूल्य अर्थात् 5000 रुपये के लिये है।

उपर्युक्त तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक जणय पत्र जमा किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिये। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति इस के द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या आई टी सी-एस एस आई० ए० 608 ए एम० 73-एन पी]

आर० जयरामन नायडू, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

Office of the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports,  
Bangalore

ORDER

Bangalore, the 24th November, 1975

**S.O. 600.**—M/s. The Mysore Palace Agarbathi Works, P. B. No. 1705, Goripalvam, Bangalore-18 were granted import licence No. P/S/1827513/R/ML/47/X/35-36 dated 6-6-1973 for Rs. 5,000 for the import of Aromatic Chemicals, N. E. Oils and Resinoids. They have now applied for duplicate copy of Customs Purposes copy of the above licence on the ground that the original of the above Customs Purposes copy of the licence has been lost without having been registered with any Customs Authorities and not utilised at all and that the duplicate copy of the above licence now required is for the full value of the licence Rs. 5,000.

In support of the above contention the applicant have filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy of the above licences has been lost and direct that a duplicate copy of Customs Purposes copy of the above licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs Purposes copy of the above licence is hereby cancelled.

[No. JTC. SSI. A. 608. AM. 73. NP]

R. JAYARAMAN NAIDU, Dy. Chief Controller

उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(औद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 फरवरी, 1976

**का. आ. 601.**—आई डी आर ए/6/6/75-विकास परिषद् (प्रक्रिया संबंधी) नियम, 1952 के नियम 3 और 8 के साथ पठित उद्योग (विकास और विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 63) की

भारतीय मानक संस्था

नई दिल्ली, 31 दिसम्बर, 1975

**का० आ० 602.**—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणित चिह्न) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सीएम/एल-3651 जिसके अधीन नीचे अनुसूची में दिए हैं, फर्म द्वारा अपना नाम मैसर्स मैकनील एण्ड बेरी लि० से मैसर्स मैकनील एण्ड मंगर लि० में बदल लेने के कारण 16 जुलाई 1975 से रद्द कर दिया गया है:—

अनुसूची

लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक
1	2	3	4
सीएम/एल-3651 7 जनवरी, 1974	मैसर्स मैकनील एण्ड बेरी लि०, 34/1, डायमंड हार्बर रोड, कलकत्ता-27 (प० बंगाल)	इनके ज्वालासह खोल : (1) स्टार-डेल्टा इकाइयों के 3 फेजी 22.5 किलो (30 हापा) तक के एक्स्टर्नल कंटेनटर स्टार्टर और बालू प्रत्यक्ष लाइन इकाइयों के लिए 400-550 वोल्ट तक की वोल्टता रेंज वाले पूर्ण अंतर्ग्रथित आइसोलेटर	IS : 2148-1968 बिजली उपकरण ज्वालासह खोलों की विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)

धारा 6 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री कीकाभाई बचकनीवाला को 16 जुलाई, 1977 तक की अवधि के लिए जिसमें यह दिन सम्मिलित हैं श्री जे. सी. बकारिया, के स्थान पर मानव निर्मित वस्तु विकास परिषद् का सदस्य नियुक्त करती हैं और भारत सरकार के उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय, औद्योगिक विकास विभाग के आदेश सं. का. आ. 2371-आई डी आर ए/6/2/75 तारीख 17 जुलाई, 1975 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती हैं, अर्थात् :—

"9. श्री कीका भाई बचकनीवाला,  
हिम्सन नायलॉन, वस्तर देवदी,  
लालदरवाजा, सुरत।"

[सं. 8/7/74-सी डी एन]

प्रेम नारायण, अवसर सचिव,

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Industrial Development)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd February, 1976

**S.O. 601.**—IDRA/6/6/75.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with rules 3 and 8 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints, Shri Kikabhai Bachkaniwala as a member of the Development Council for Man-made Textiles, vice Shri J. G. Vakaria, for a period upto and inclusive the 16th July, 1977 and makes the following amendment in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry and Civil Supplies, Department of Industrial Development S.O. 2371-IDRA/6/2/75, dated the 17th July, 1975, namely :—

In the said Order, in paragraph 1, for serial No. 9, the following serial No. shall be substituted, namely:—

"9. Shri Kikabhai Bachkaniwala,  
Himson Nylons,  
Vastar Devdi, Lal Darwaja,  
Surat".

[No. 8/7/74-CDN]

PREM NARAIN, Under Secy.



1	2	3	4
		ग्रुप I और ग्रुप II ए के लिए टाइप एकएलपी/सीएस ग्रुप II ए के लिए टाइप एकएलपी/एसएफ	
	(2)	तेल सिमोया सर्किट ब्रेकर इकाई संख्या 1 कैलिजनुमा, 100 अम्पी 550 वोल्ट तक (ग्रुप I और II ए)	
	(3)	कंटेक्टर टाइप स्विच इकाई 7.5 किवा (10 हापा) 400- 550 वोल्ट टाइप तक 'सी ए 10' (ग्रुप II ए)	
	(4)	650 वोल्ट तक के पुश बटन स्टेशन, 1 अम्पी दो बटन अथवा एक बटन वाले टाइप एकएलपी/ पीबी (ग्रुप I और II ए)	
	(5)	प्रकाश ट्रांसफार्मर, 1.5 किबो अम्पी, एक फेज प्राथमिक वोल्टता 400 से 650 वोल्ट तक, द्वितीय वोल्टता 115 से 125 वोल्ट (ग्रुप I)	
	(6)	ज्वालासह आइसोलेटर इकाई, टाइप एकएलपी / आईएस ज्वाइंट-बॉक्स, ग्रुप I, II ए और II बी के लिए टाइप एक- एलपी/जे बी	

[सं० सी० एम० डी० 55 : 3651/इटी]

ए० डी० राव, उपमहानिदेशक

## INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

New Delhi, the 31st December, 1975

S. O. 602.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-3651 particulars of which are given below has been cancelled with effect from 16 July, 1975 due to change in licensee's name from M/s. Macneill & Barry Ltd. to M/s. Macneill & Magor Ltd.:-

Licence No. and date	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process covered by the licence cancelled	Relevant Indian Standard
1	2	3	4
CM/L-3651 7 January, 1974	M/s. Macneill & Barry Ltd., 34/1 Diamond Harbour Road, Calcutta-27 (West Bengal).	Flameproof enclosures for: (i) Air-break contractor starter unit 3-phase upto 22.5 kW (30 HP) for star-delta units and up to 30 KW (40 HP) for direct on line units voltage range upto 400—550 volts complete with inter-locked isolator. Type FLP/CS for Group I & IIA Type ELP/SF for Group IIA (ii) Oil immersed circuit breaker unit No. 1 horizontal, upto 100 amp 550 volts (Group I & IIA) (iii) Contractor type switch unit upto 7.5 kW (10 HP) 400—550 volts type 'CS10' (Group IIA). (iv) Push Button station upto 650 volts, lamp with two buttons or one button type FLP/PB-1 (Group I & IIA). (v) Lighting transformer, 1.5 KVA, single-phase primary voltage 400 to 550 volts, secondary voltage 115 to 125 volts (Group I). (vi) Flameproof isolator unit, Type FLP/IS and Joint Box Type FLP/JB for Group I, IIA and IIB.	IS: 2148-1968 Specification for flameproof enclosures of electrical apparatus (First Revision).

## स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 1976

का० धा० 603.—संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक और अनुच्छेद 148 की धारा (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में काम कर रहे व्यक्तियों के बारे में भारत के नियंत्रक एवं महालेखा परीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) नियमावली 1975 में संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, नामतः :—

1.(1) इन नियमों को केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) संशोधित नियमावली, 1976 कहा जाएगा।

(2) ये सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशन होने की तिथि से लागू होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) नियमावली, 1975 के नियम 1 के स्पष्टीकरण के अंत में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि जोड़ी जाएगी, अर्थातः—

“और इसमें मद्रास के ऐसे निकटवर्ती क्षेत्र भी शामिल हैं जिन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सरकारी राजपत्र में अधिसूचित किया जाएगा।”

[संख्या एस० 11011/1/76-के० धा० स्वा० यो०]

## MINISTRY OF HEALTH &amp; FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1976

S.O. 603.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules to amend the Central Government Health Scheme (Madras) Rules, 1975, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Government Health Scheme (Madras) Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Central Government Health Scheme (Madras) Rules, 1975, in rule 1, in the Explanation, the following shall be added at the end, namely :—

“and includes such contiguous areas of Madras as may be notified by the Central Government in the Official Gazette”.

[No. S. 11011/1/75-CGHS]

नई दिल्ली, 15 जनवरी, 1976

का० धा० 604.—केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) नियमावली, 1975 के नियम (1) के उपनियम (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त नियमावली को 16 जनवरी, 1976 से मद्रास के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में भी लागू करती है, अर्थातः—

1. के० के० नगर डिस्पेंसरी (टी. नगर डिस्पेंसरी को उप-डिस्पेंसरी)

उत्तर में वडा-पालानी डिपो रोड और पेरियर पथाय के संगम से चलकर पूर्व की ओर पेरियर पथाय के साथ साथ वहाँ तक आगे बढ़िए

जहाँ ब्रह्मदीसवर कायल काम स्ट्रीट से इसका संगम होता है फिर वहाँ से दक्षिण की ओर ब्रह्मदीसवर कायल काम स्ट्रीट, सीवान कायल के साथ साथ वहाँ तक बढ़िये जहाँ इसका संगम ग्रकोट रोड से होता है, फिर पूर्व की ओर ग्रकोट रोड के साथ साथ रेलवे लाइन के संगम तक चले, फिर वहाँ से दक्षिण की ओर रेलवे लाइन के साथ साथ वहाँ तक बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम वासुदेवपुरम् से होता है, फिर वहाँ से पश्चिम की ओर वासुदेवपुरम् चक्रपार्ण स्ट्रीट के साथ साथ वहाँ तक बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम आर्या गोडर रोड से होता है, फिर वहाँ से दक्षिण की ओर आर्या गोडर रोड, कयराय स्ट्रीट कोडम्बकम रोड वेस्ट के साथ-साथ वहाँ तक बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम जोम्स रोड से होता है, फिर वहाँ से पश्चिम की ओर जोम्स रोड के साथ-साथ वहाँ तक चले जहाँ इसका संगम अडयार नदी से होता है, फिर वहाँ से उत्तर की ओर शहर की सीमा के साथ साथ वहाँ तक बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम अशोक पिलर रोड से होता है फिर पश्चिम की ओर इस सड़क के साथ-साथ वहाँ तक चले जहाँ इसका संगम आलगिरिस्वामी रोड से होता है फिर उत्तर की ओर आलगिरिस्वामी रोड पिरान साहिब स्ट्रीट (ए० बी० एम० स्टूडियो के निकट) के साथ साथ वहाँ तक आगे बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम ग्रकोट रोड से होता है, फिर वहाँ से पूर्व की ओर ग्रकोट रोड पर वहाँ तक चले जहाँ इसका संगम वडा-पालानी बस टर्मिनस से होता है, फिर उत्तर की ओर वडा-पालानी डिपो रोड के साथ साथ उस स्थान तक बढ़े जहाँ से पहले चले थे।

## 2. वेशम्बुर

पश्चिम में न्यू मवाडी रोड और शहरी सीमा के संगम से चलकर मवाडी रोड तक पहुँचने के लिये शहरी सीमा के साथ साथ उत्तर की ओर फिर पूर्व की ओर बढ़े, फिर इस मवाली रोड के साथ साथ आगे वहाँ तक बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम बकिषम कैनाल से होता है, फिर दक्षिण की ओर इस कैनाल के साथ साथ आगे बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम शोतट्टर नाळा से होता है, फिर इस नाळे के साथ साथ वहाँ तक आगे बढ़े जहाँ इसका संगम न्यू मवाडी रोड से होता है, फिर पश्चिम की ओर इस रोड पर वहाँ तक आगे जहाँ से पहले चले थे।

[सं० एस० 11011/1/75-के० ए० स्वा० यो०]

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1976

S.O. 604.—In pursuance of sub-rule (3) of rule 1 of the Central Government Health Scheme (Madras) Rules, 1975, the Central Government hereby extends the said rules with effect from the 16th January, 1976 to the following areas in Madras namely :—

1. K. K. Nagar Dispensary (Sub-dispensary to T. Nagar Dispensary).

On the north, starting from the junction of Vada-palani Depot Road and Periyar Pathai, proceed east along Periyar Pathai upto its junction with Brahadeeswarar Koil Cross Street, proceed south along Brahadeeswarar Koil Cross Street, Silvan Koil proceed south along Brahadeeswarar Koil Cross Street, Silvan Koil Street, upto its junction with Arcot Road, then proceed east along Arcot Road upto its junction with the Railway line, proceed south along the Railway line with its junction with Vasudevapuram, proceed west along Vasudevapuram Chakrapani Street upto its junction with Arya Gowder Road, proceed south along Arya Gowder Road—Kavarai Street—Kodambakkam Road West, upto its junction with Jones Road, then proceed west along the Jones Road upto its junction with Adayar river, proceed north along the city boundary upto its junction with Ashok Pillar Road, proceed west along the road upto its junction with Alagiriswamy Road, proceed north along Alagiriswamy Road—Piran Sahib Street (Adjacent A.V.M. Studio) upto its junction with Arcot Road, proceed east along Arcot Road upto its junction with

Vadapalani Bus Terminus, then proceed north along the Vadapalani Depot Road to reach the starting point.

## 2. Perambur.

On the west, starting from the junction of New Avadi Road and the city limit, proceed north and east along the City limits to reach Manali Road, proceed along Manali Road upto its junction with Buckingham Canal, proceed south along the Canal to junction with Otter Nullah, proceed along the Nullah upto its junction with New Avadi Road, proceed west along the Road to reach starting point.

[No. S-11011/1/75-CGHS]

का० प्रा० 605.—केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) नियमावली, 1975 के नियम 1 के स्पष्टीकरण के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित सारणी में दिए गए क्षेत्रों को उक्त नियम के प्रयोगों के लिए क्षेत्र अधिसूचित करती है।

### सारणी

पूर्व में नगर निगम की बाउण्ड्री के भीतर वडापलानी बस स्टैंड से अशोक पिलर तक का क्षेत्र; दक्षिण में अशोक पिलर रोड से एलागिरी स्वामी रोड जंक्शन तक, पश्चिम में अशोक पिलर जंक्शन से एलागिरी स्वामी रोड के साथ साथ ए०वी०एम० स्टूडियो से लगा हुआ पिरान साहिब स्ट्रीट तक, उत्तर में ए०वी०एम० स्टूडियो से लगी हुई पिरान साहिब स्ट्रीट को जोड़ने वाली सड़क से वडापलानी बस स्टैंड तक का क्षेत्र।

[सं० एस० 11011/1/75-के०स० स्वा०यो०]

बी० रामचन्द्रन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 605.—In pursuance of the Explanation to rule 1 of the Central Government Health Scheme (Madras) Rules, 1975, the Central Government hereby notifies the areas specified in the Table below as the areas for the purposes of the said rule.

### TABLE

In the East Area bounded by the Municipal Corporation Boundary from Vadapalani Bus Terminus to Ashok Pillar; In the South by the Ashok Pillar Road to Allagiriswamy Road junction; in the West from the junction of Ashok Pillars proceeding on Allagiriswamy Road, Piran Sahib Street adjacent to A.V.M. Studio; In the North road linking Piran Sahib Street adjacent to A.V.M. Studio to Vadapalani Bus Terminus.

[No. S-11011/1/75-CGHS]

V. RAMACHANDRAN, Under Secy.

### कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

(खाद्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1976

का० प्रा० 606.—केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम, भाण्डागारण निगम अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 58) की धारा 42क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और केन्द्रीय सरकार की पूर्व मंजूरी से केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम (साधारण) विनियम, 1965 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित विनियम बनाता है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन विनियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम (साधारण) संशोधन विनियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय भाण्डागारण निगम (साधारण) विनियम, 1965 में,—

(i) विनियम 11 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित विनियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“विनियम 10 के अन्तर्गत आने वाले निदेशक को, जो विनियम 12 के अन्तर्गत नहीं आता, बोर्ड, कार्यपालिका, समिति या किसी उप-समिति के अधिवेशनों में भाग लेने के लिए या निगम के किसी अन्य कारबार के सम्बन्ध में की गई यात्राओं की बाबत ऐसी बरों पर यात्रा व्यय की प्रतिपूर्ति की जाएगी और वह ऐसी बरों पर दैनिक भत्ते का हकदार होगा, जो समय-समय पर प्रबंध निदेशकों के लिए अनुशेष हों:

परन्तु यदि निदेशक लोक सभा का सदस्य है तो उसे वित्त मंत्रालय (व्यय विभाग) के समय-समय पर यथासंशोधित कार्यालय ज्ञापन सं० एक० 6(26)ई-4/59, तारीख 5 सितम्बर, 1969 में विहित बरों के अनुसार उसके यात्रा-व्ययों की प्रतिपूर्ति की जाएगी और वह उन्हीं बरों के अनुसार दैनिक भत्ते का हकदार होगा।”

(ii) विनियम 31 में उपविनियम (3) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-विनियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(3) कोई भी व्यक्ति निगम के अधिवेशनों में सम्मेल्यता प्राधिकृत प्रतिनिधि के रूप में तब तक भाग नहीं ले सकेगा या मतदान नहीं कर सकेगा जब तक उसे सम्मेल्यता प्राधिकृत प्रतिनिधि के रूप में नियुक्त करने वाले संकल्प की एक प्रति, जो उस अधिवेशन के, जिसमें वह पारित किया गया था, अध्यक्ष द्वारा या यथास्थिति, शेयरधारी संस्था के निदेशक बोर्ड, प्रबंध समिति या शासी निकाय के पीठासीन अधिकारी द्वारा या उसके सचिव या प्रबंधक द्वारा सत्य प्रति के रूप में प्रमाणित हो, जिस पर उसके हस्ताक्षर और उसके पद की मोहर होगी, अधिवेशन के लिए नियत तारीख से कम से कम पूरे चार दिन पहले निगम के प्रधान कार्यालय में जमा न कर दी गई हो।”

[का० सं० 6-30/74-एस० जी०]

ए० के० गर्द, अवर सचिव

### MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE & IRRIGATION

(Department of Food)

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1976

S.O. 606.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 42 of the Warehousing Corporations Act, 1962 (58 of 1962), the Central Warehousing Corporation, with the previous sanction of the Central Government, hereby makes the following regulations further to amend the Central Warehousing Corporation (General) Regulations, 1965, namely:—

1. (1) These regulations may be called Central Warehousing Corporation (General) Amendment Regulations, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Central Warehousing Corporation (General) Regulations, 1965,—

(i) for regulation 11, the following regulation shall be substituted, namely:—

“11. Allowances to Directors other than Members of State Legislatures, salaried officers etc.—

A, director falling under regulation 10 and not falling under regulation 12 shall be reimbursed his travelling expenses and shall be entitled to daily allowance for attending the meeting of the Board

or of the Executive Committee or of a sub-committee or in respect of journeys undertaken by him in connection with any other business of the Corporation at such rates as may be admissible to the Managing Director of the Corporation from time to time.

Provided that if the Director is a member of Parliament, he shall be reimbursed his travelling expenses and shall be entitled to daily allowance in accordance with the rates prescribed in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) Office Memorandum No. F. 6(26)/EIV/59, dated the 5th September, 1969, as amended from time to time.”;

(ii) in regulation 31, for sub-regulation (3), the following sub-regulation shall be substituted, namely :—

“(3) No person shall attend or vote at any meeting of the Corporation as a duly authorised representative unless a copy of the resolution appointing him as duly authorised representative certified to be a true copy by the Chairman of the meeting at which it was passed or by the Presiding Officer of the board of directors, managing committee or governing body, as the case may be, of the shareholder institution, or by the Secretary or the Manager thereof signed under the seal of his Office, shall have been deposited at the Head Office of the Corporation not less than four clear days before the date fixed for the meeting.”

[F. No. 6-30/74-SG]

A. K. GARDE, Under Secy.

### रेल मंत्रालय

#### (रेल बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जनवरी, 1976

क्र० आ० 607.—भारतीय रेल अधिनियम, 1890 (1890 का 9) की धारा 58 ख की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, अपना यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि किसी रेलवे स्टेशन तक केवल माल को ले जाने के लिए प्राणयित रेल गाड़ियों द्वारा बुक किए गए माल का, ऐसे स्टेशन से अधिलम्ब हटाया जाना आवश्यक है और उस उपधारा के परन्तुक में विनिर्दिष्ट बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए निम्नलिखित रेल स्टेशनों को 1 फरवरी, 1976 से 6 महीने की अवधि के लिए “अधिसूचित” स्टेशन घोषित करती है ; अर्थात् :—

1. मुम्बई (बाड़ी बन्दर)
2. नागपुर
3. हावड़ा गुड्स
4. इलाहाबाद
5. कानपुर सेंट्रल गुड्स शीड (बाड गेज)
6. नई दिल्ली
7. भद्रास साल्ट कोटारस
8. एणकुलम गुड्स
9. बंगलौर सिटी जंक्शन
10. शालीमार
11. कांकरिया
12. बड़ीवा जंक्शन
13. असरवा जंक्शन
14. मुम्बई (कार्मिक ब्रिज)
15. रांची
16. टाटानगर
17. म्यू गुवाहाटी
18. न्यू जलपाईगुरी

[सं० टी० सी० I/1680/74/1]

ए० एल० गुप्ता, सचिव रेल और पदेन संयुक्त सचिव

### MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

#### (Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1976

S.O. 607.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 56B of the Indian Railways Act, 1890 (9 of 1890), the Central Government, being satisfied that it is necessary that goods booked by trains intended solely for the carriage of goods to any railway station should be removed without delay from such railway station and having regard to the factors specified in the proviso to that sub-section, hereby declares the following railway stations as “notified stations” for a period of six months with effect from the 1st February, 1976, namely :—

1. Bombay (Wadi Bandar)
2. Nagpur.
3. Howrah Goods.
4. Allahabad.
5. Kanpur Central Goods Shed (Broad Gauge).
6. New Delhi.
7. Madras Salt Cotaurs.
8. Ernakulam Goods.
9. Bangalore City Junction.
10. Shalimar.
11. Kankaria.
12. Baroda Junction.
13. Asarva Junction.
14. Bombay (Carnac Bridge).
15. Ranchi.
16. Tatanagar.
17. New Gauhati.
18. New Jalpaiguri.

[No. TCI/1680/74/1]

A. L. GUPTA, Secy. Railway Board and  
ex-officio Jt. Secy.

### पूति और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

#### (पुनर्वास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 जनवरी, 1976

क्र० आ० 608.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 34 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार, पूति और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (पुनर्वास विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या 2(8)/विशेष सेल/एस० एस०-4/69, दिनांक 15 मई, 1974 का प्रतिक्रमण करते हुए मैं, कुसुम प्रसाद, मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त, राजस्व तथा वन विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या एस० एस०/1075/4412 (गोपनीय) आर-7, दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1975 के अन्तर्गत महाराष्ट्र सरकार द्वारा महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए नियुक्त किए गए बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त श्री जी० एस० बास्ले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 23, 24 एवं 28 के अन्तर्गत मेरे द्वारा प्रयोग की जा सकने वाली शक्तियाँ इस शर्त पर सौंपता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए उक्त बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त मद्रासवा संभार की ऐसी सम्पत्तियों के संबंध में, जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य में स्थित नहीं हैं, इस प्रकार की किसी शक्ति का प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे।

[संख्या 2(8)/69/विशेष सेल/एस० एस०-II]

कुसुम प्रसाद, मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त

## MINISTRY OF SUPPLY &amp; REHABILITATION

(Department of Rehabilitation)

New Delhi, the 12th January, 1976

**S.O. 608.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) No. 2(8)/Sp/Cell/SS IV/69, dated the 15th May, 1974, I Kusum Prasad, Chief Settlement Commissioner hereby delegate to Shri G. S. Wagle, Settlement Commissioner for Maharashtra State appointed by the Government of Maharashtra under Revenue and forests Department Notification No. HS/1075/4412(Contd.) R-7, dated the 2nd December, 1975, the powers conferred on me by or under section 23, 24 and 28 of the said Act, subject to the condition that the said Settlement Commissioner for the State of Maharashtra shall not exercise any much powers in relation to the compensation pool properties not situated in Maharashtra State.

[No. 2(8)/69/Spl. Cell/SS. II]

KUSUM PRASAD, Chief Settlement Commissioner

## अम मंत्रालय

भारत

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1975

का० प्र० 609.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाय्य अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में पंजाब नेशनल बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या पंजाब नेशनल बैंक प्रधान कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली के प्रबंधक का श्री दीलत राम को 22 जून, 1974 से स्थायी चालक के रूप में नियुक्त न करना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल-12012/136/75-डी-2ए]

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd October, 1975

**S.O. 609.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Punjab National Bank and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Is the management of the Punjab National Bank, Head Office New Delhi, justified in not appointing Shri Daulat Ram as a permanent Driver with effect from the 22nd June 1974 ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled.

[No. L-12012/136/75-DII/A]

भारत

नई दिल्ली, 28 अक्टूबर, 1975

का० प्र० 610.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाय्य अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भारतीय स्टेट बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एच० प्र० सोधी होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय चण्डीगढ़ में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या भारतीय स्टेट बैंक क्षेत्र नई दिल्ली के प्रबंधक का सेक्टर 17 चण्डीगढ़ स्थित उक्त बैंक के रोकड़ कुली श्री श्री राम को उक्त बैंक के 7 अगस्त, 1972 के परिपत्र संख्या 34 के अनुसार अभिलेखागार के रूप में स्थापना न कराने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो, उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एल-12012/123/75-डी-2/ए]

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th October, 1975

**S.O. 610.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri H. R. Sodhi shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Chandigarh and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Management of the State Bank of India, Region V, New Delhi, in denying Shri Sri Ram, Cash Coolie of the said Bank at Sector, 17, Chandigarh, to officiate as Record

Keeper in terms of the said Bank's Circular No. 34 of 7th April 1972 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/123/75/DII/A]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 1975

का० आ० 611.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में यूनाइटेड बैंक आफ इंडिया से संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, प्रब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० (1) मुम्बई को न्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या यूनाइटेड बैंक आफ इंडिया, कलकत्ता के प्रबन्धतंत्र का श्री एस० के० पारेख की सेवाएं 10 मार्च, 1975 से समाप्त करना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल-12012/127/75-डी-2/ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th October, 1975

S.O. 611.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the United Bank of India and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal No. (1), Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of the United Bank of India, Calcutta is justified in terminating the services of Shri S. K. Parekh with effect from the 10th March 1975? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/127/75/DII/A]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 31 अक्टूबर, 1975

का० आ० 612.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में पंजाब नेशनल बैंक से संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, प्रब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या पंजाब नेशनल बैंक, जयपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, श्री सुरजीत सिंह, लिपिक-एवं-रोकड़िया की सेवाएं 4 जनवरी, 1970 से समाप्त करने को कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल-12012/145/73-एल० आर० III]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 31st October, 1975

S.O. 612.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Punjab National Bank and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi constituted under section 7A of the said Act ;

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Punjab National Bank Jaipur, in terminating the services of Shri Surjit Singh, clerk-cum-cashier with effect from the 4th January 1970 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/145/73/LRIII]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 1975

का० आ० 613.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भारतीय स्टेट बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, प्रब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण दिल्ली को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

**अनुसूची**

क्या भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, क्षेत्र, नई दिल्ली के भूतपूर्व प्रस्थायी रोकड़िया श्री रामचन्द्र उक्त बैंक के स्थायी नियोजन में प्रवेशन के हकदार है। यदि हां तो किस तारीख से, तथा उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है।

[सं० एल-12012/121/75-डी-II/ए]

**ORDER**

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1975

**S.O. 613.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

**THE SCHEDULE**

Whether Shri Mam Chand, Ex-temporary Cashier State Bank of India, Region V, New Delhi is entitled to absorption in the permanent employment of the said Bank? If so, from what date and to what other relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/121/75-DII/A]

**आदेश**

नई दिल्ली, 11 नवम्बर, 1975

का० धा० 614.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सेण्ट्रल बैंक आफ इण्डिया, जण्डीगढ़ से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है :

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एच० आर० सोढी होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जण्डीगढ़ में होगा उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

**अनुसूची**

क्या सेण्ट्रल बैंक आफ इण्डिया, जण्डीगढ़ के प्रबन्धसंरक्ष की, श्री रामेश्वर राजकुमार, चपरासी का उक्त बैंक की भम्बाला छावनीशाखा में स्थापत्यन न करने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल-12012/79/75-डी-2/ए]

**ORDER**

New Delhi, the 11th November, 1975

**S.O. 614.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in

relation to the Central Bank of India, Chandigarh and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri H. R. Sodhi shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Chandigarh and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

**THE SCHEDULE**

Whether the action of the management of the Central Bank of India, Chandigarh, in denying the transfer of Shri Rameshwar Raj Kumar, Peon, Rurka Khurd to Ambala Cantonment Branch of the said Bank is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/79/75-DII/A]

**आदेश**

का० धा० 615.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में इलाहाबाद बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

**अनुसूची**

क्या इलाहाबाद बैंक रोकड़िया कर्मचारी संगम की यह मांग, कि उक्त बैंक की बड़ा बाजार शाखा के श्री कैलाश नाथ सेठ रोकड़ लिफ्ट को उक्त बैंक की लेक गार्डन शाखा में प्रधान रोकड़िया के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें 21 अक्टूबर, 1973 के प्रधान रोकड़िया सो-प्रवर्ग के भत्तों का संदाय भी किया जाना चाहिए न्यायोचित है ? यदि हां, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल-12012/144/75-डी-2/ए]

**ORDER**

**S.O. 615.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## THE SCHEDULE

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1976

Is the demand of the Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association that Shri Kailash Nath Seth, cash clerk, Burrabazar Branch of the said Bank should be posted as Head Cashier in the Lake Garden Branch of the said Bank and paid allowances as Head Cashier, Category C, with effect from the 21st October, 1973 is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/144/75-DII/A]

मादेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 1975

क्र० आ० 616.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भारतीय स्टेट बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एच० आर० सोधी होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय बण्डीगढ़ में होगा और उक्त विवाद औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, क्षेत्र 2, नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्धतंत्र की उक्त बैंक की डेहरा शाखा के अधीन उप कार्यालय चित्तपूर्ण के अंश कालिक, सन्देशवाहक श्री भरेन्द्र सरवाहा कार्य समय में कटौती करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ।

[सं० एल-12012/94/75-डी-2ए]

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1975

S.O. 616.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the mater specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri H. R. Sodhi shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Chandigarh and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of India, Region II, New Delhi, in curtailing the hours of work of Shri Narinder, Marwaha, Part-Time Messenger, Chintpurni sub-office the Dehra Branch of the said Bank with effect from the 28th December 1974 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/94/75-DII/A]

S.O. 617.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th January, 1976.

## BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

## PRESENT :

Shri K. K. Sarkar, Presiding Officer.

## Reference No. 5 of 1972

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Ministry's Order No. L. 12012/53/72/LRIII dated 4-9-72)

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the State Bank of India.

AND

Their Workmen

## APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Employers—Shri M. N. Mishra, and Shri H. N. Singh, State Bank of India, Patna.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri G. K. Verma, Secretary, State Bank of India Employees Union, Bihar State.

STATE : Bihar,

INDUSTRY : Banking.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 9th January, 1976.

## AWARD

This is a reference which was sent by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour to this Tribunal for adjudication of the Industrial dispute involved with the following issues framed :—

"1. Whether the action of the State Bank of India in denying promotion as Head Clerk to Shri Kamalan Shan Sharma, a clerk in the Regional Manager's office of the Bank at Patna was justified?

2. If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

The case of the workmen shortly stated is as follows : Shri Kamalan Shan Sharma joined the Bank of Bihar services on 5th March, 1965, and was confirmed as Clerk in the same post on 1st July, 1965. The Bank of Bihar was amalgamated with the State Bank of India under the orders of the Central Government under a scheme of amalgamation. Accordingly Shri Sharma along with all the employees of the Bank of Bihar were taken over by the State Bank of India which is the transferee Bank with continuity of service and with the same terms and conditions of service as enjoyed by the employees of State Bank of India w.e.f. 1-1-70. Shri Sharma was posted in the Head office of the Bank of Bihar and after amalgamation he was posted in the Regional Manager's Office, State Bank of India, Patna. In July, 1971 many regular clerks of the State Bank of India who are junior to Shri Sharma in length of service were appointed as acting and officiating clerks against permanent post. Not only Shri Sharma but many other senior clerks belonging to the erstwhile Bank of Bihar were superseded and fitted differently from regular State Bank Employees. This supersession were discriminatory and arbitrary on the part of the State Bank of India Patna and this action of the State Bank of India is invalid and unjustified. It is further maintained that there was no authority for the State Bank of India Patna to appoint acting and officiating Head Clerk against permanent vacancies and the appointment should have been as Head Clerks. It is prayed that Shri Sharma be promoted as Head Clerk with retrospective effect making good the pecuniary loss suffered by him.



The case of the employers in short is that consequent upon the amalgamation, the control and administration of the Bank of Bihar passed on to the then Regional Manager's office of State Bank of India, Patna w.e.f. 8-11-69. As such, Officers and other employees attached to the Head Office to the Bank of Bihar were rendered surplus to the requirement of the Regional Manager's office, State Bank of India, Patna and so the employees of the Bank of Bihar were for the time being placed in supernumerary capacity in Regional Manager's office at Patna including Shri Sharma. Due to exigency of administration it became necessary to appoint acting headclerks at the then Regional Manager's office at Patna on ad-hoc basis in the interest of administration. Shri Sharma could not be given the post of Head clerk because he had only 1-1/2 years of service in the State Bank of India and he had yet to acquire sufficient job knowledge and working procedure of the State Bank of India to cope with the work of Head Clerk. For making appointment in the post of head clerks seniority was not the only factor but other factors like experience, job knowledge, suitability capacity to bear the responsibility of the post etc. were also relevant factors. So in making appointment of head clerk a good deal of discretion vested with the bank in the matter. This non-appointment of Mr. Sharma as Head Clerk did not cause any prejudice to him in any respect. By April, 1972 he had put more years service in the State Bank of India and he was considered suitable and appointed as Head Clerk. Later Shri Sharma qualified in the Written test of Gr. II officer of the Bank and he was posted as Grade II Officer where he has been working. Shri Sharma realised the position and submitted a petition to the Tribunal withdrawing his claim for promotion as Head Clerk on and from 1st July, 1972. It is further contended that by the withdrawal of his case by Shri Sharma and also by his subsequent appointment as head clerk and then as Officer Gr. II during the pendency of Industrial adjudication the industrial dispute ceased to exist any more and accordingly the case is not maintainable.

By the pleadings of the parties the basic facts regarding appointment transfer, non-appointment as officiating head clerk on 1st July, 1971 and other connected matters have been established so I need not reiterate those facts. The short question for consideration and division is if the non-appointment of Shri Sharma as Head Clerk in July, 1971 is unjustified. I should first see how the position of the employees of the erstwhile Bank of Bihar turned on its amalgamation with the State Bank of India, Patna. The case of the management is that the employees of the Bank of Bihar who were posted at their head office at Patna and whose services were transferred to the State Bank of India as a result of the amalgamation became surplus to the requirement of regional manager's office at Patna and as such they were placed in supernumerary capacity. This is denied from the side of the workmen. Shri G. K. Verma, Secretary of the Union who represented the case of the workmen before me submits that this incidence of "surplus" and "supernumerary capacity" is not authorised by the scheme of amalgamation (Ext. M.2). It is true that in the scheme of amalgamation the question like "surplus" "supernumerary" capacity did not find place. But it should not be lost sight of that the scheme of amalgamation dealt with the broad facts regarding amalgamation of the two banks and not minutest details. So absence of such a provision in the scheme of amalgamation in my opinion does not stand as a bar. This was, so to say a, "practical politics" of the State Bank of India. The fact remains that there was a sizeable number of employees in the head office of the erstwhile bank of Bihar and they were all passed on to the State Bank of India at Patna and at Regional Manager's office of State Bank of India. It is not the case of the workmen that the Regional Manager's office of State Bank of India, Patna was suffering from shortage of staff at that particular time so that this additional burden of staff transferred from Bank of Bihar to State Bank of India Patna would meet up that shortage. It can be presumed in the ordinary circumstances that the Regional Manager's office at Patna were having more or less full complement of their staff strength. If under such circumstances a sizeable number of employees of the Head Office of the erstwhile Bank of Bihar are switched on to the R. M's office at Patna, the only reasonable conclusion to infer is that the transferred employees of Bank of Bihar would be more or less surplus to the requirement of the Regional Manager's office at Patna. So the contention of the State Bank of India that they became surplus cannot be ruled out. That it was so would be apparent from a copy of letter dated 8th November, 1969 from the Regional Manager, State Bank of India to Shri Kamalanar Sharma (Ext. M. 3). It has been clearly stated therein that as a result of amalgamation, the staff on the

establishment of the head office of the Bank of Bihar would become surplus to the requirement of the State Bank of India at Patna and accordingly it was decided to attach Shri K. Sharma in supernumerary capacity pending his posting elsewhere. It does not appear that in 1969 when this letter was issued to Shri Sharma he challenged the action of the management in declaring him surplus and putting him in supernumerary capacity for the time being. It is not improper to think that this thing happened with other employees of the establishment of the then Bank of Bihar. Whatever may be the scheme of amalgamation, this is a fact which was inevitable and it must be faced. However, this fact is not very important for our purpose. The next point that was urged by Shri G. K. Verma before me is that the Shastry Award followed by Desai Award do not stipulate appointment of acting and officiating head clerks on ad-hoc basis which was alleged to be the practice of the State Bank of India and which was also put into practice when employees junior to Shri Sharma were appointed as officiating head clerk on ad-hoc basis in July, 1971. From the side of the management it has not been shown to me that the Shastry Award followed by Desai Award made any provision for appointment of officiating head clerk on ad-hoc basis. I think that even though there is no such provision in the Bank Award it becomes necessary in certain circumstances and in my opinion this appointment of temporary/acting head clerk on ad-hoc basis does not militate against the Bank Award known as Shastry Award and Desai Award. There may be post of permanent head clerk, but I think it is a general principle practised by all the employers to put persons in officiating capacity against permanent vacancies in the first instance and after rendering some period of service they are put as regular permanent head clerk. It appears that the Bank did not take recourse to the appointment of officiating head clerk at the time of concerned workman alone but it was their prevailing practice to appoint officiating head clerk. Ext. W. 3 is a copy of letter from the Personnel Manager of the local head office of the State Bank of India Patna dated 8th August, 1972. It is revealed the reform that there was no permanent head clerk in any department of that office and the system of acting head clerk in permanent vacancies was in vogue prior to the issue of that letter. By that letter the management wanted to post permanent head clerk at some department where necessary. I do not think that the Union of workmen can challenge this practice that was prevailing at one time and when it appears that it was not challenged any time before. The appointment of acting head clerk at the relevant time was therefore in consonance with the practice that was obtaining in the State Bank of India at that time and I do not think that this Tribunal is entitled to find fault with the State Bank of India in this respect. So the point boils down to this that in April, 1971 the State Bank of India at Patna appointed some officiating head clerks on ad-hoc basis to meet the exigency of the situation and in my opinion there was nothing wrong in it. Admittedly for the appointment of clerks as officiating head clerks no test was required. In this connection it may be mentioned that at the relevant time post of head clerks was not considered as promotion from the post of ordinary clerk because both the categories were enjoying the same scale of pay but persons appointed as officiating head clerks were given some special allowance. The point for consideration is if Shri K. Sharma was superseded in July, 1971 when he was not appointed as acting head clerk. It is not denied from the side of the Bank that some regular State Bank of India Employees who were junior to Shri Sharma were appointed as officiating head clerk in July, 1971. The justification as advanced by the management is that the working procedure and nature of work in the State Bank of India was somewhat different from those obtaining in the erstwhile Bank of Bihar. As at the relevant time Shri Sharma was having only 1-1/2 years of service in the State Bank, he did not acquire sufficient job knowledge and working procedure of the State Bank of India i.e. why people junior to him who were regular employees of the State Bank of India from before and were considered suitable were posted as officiating head clerks. Admittedly Shri K. Sharma was not the only employee of the erstwhile Bank of Bihar who was not appointed as officiating head clerk at the relevant time but some other employees of the erstwhile employees of the Bank were not similarly appointed as acting head clerk at that time. If the case of Shri Sharma was the solitary exception I can appreciate that the Bank adopted a discriminatory policy in regard to him. But when it appears that his was not the only case but some more employees of the Bank of Bihar were also involved in this supersession, it cannot perhaps be said that discriminatory treatment was meted out to Shri K. N. Sharma alone. Shri G. K. Verma submits that the State Bank of

India discriminated against practically all the employees of the erstwhile Bank of Bihar and this reference also includes their case in an indirect way. I am not concerned about the other case of supersession as under the law its jurisdiction is only limited to the case of Kamalan Sharma alone. Learned representative from the side of the workmen Shri G. K. Verma refers me to the Shastry Award and Desai Bank Award to show that though seniority is not the only criterion for the promotion but senior persons cannot be superseded unless there is some adverse remarks in their service book and all that. Shastry Award and Desai Award do not prescribe that seniority is the only criterion for promotion but other consideration like suitability, capacity to bear responsibility etc. are to be taken into consideration. It is submitted that the Bank has not shown before the Court that there was any adverse remarks in the service of Shri K. N. Sharma or that he was inefficient in any way. True, but our present case is quite different from the case as envisaged in the Shastry Award and the Desai Award. They deal with promotion from one category to another. Our case is not the case of promotion from one category to another, but it is a case of placing one clerk as officiating head clerk in the same category with some special allowance. It has not been shown that when the persons are in the same scale and category, some payment of allowance to one of them in preference to others is a case of promotion. As it is not a case of promotion, the provision in the Shastry Award and Desai Award with regard to the question of promotion cannot in my opinion be squarely applied in the present case. The reason as advanced from the side of the management in not appointing the concerned workman and other senior clerks of the erstwhile bank of Bihar as officiating head clerks does not appear to be fallacious. As we know that the State Bank of India is the successor of the then Imperial Bank of India. The learned representative of the State Bank of India Shri H. N. Singh submits that though Imperial Bank was a commercial bank to some extent like the bank of Bihar, it had and has some special job which was not strictly commercial in nature and the performance of which requires some job knowledge which cannot be acquired by outsider in a short time. Admittedly Shri Sharma had 1-1/2 years service when he was not appointed as officiating head clerk. I do not think that it was so much necessary to test the suitability of candidates to put them temporarily in the post of officiating head clerks. As a matter of fact no test was prescribed for the appointment of officiating head clerk at the relevant time. When there was no such test it cannot be said that all senior clerks were eligible to be appointed as officiating head clerk as a matter of right. When they were appointed as officiating head clerks it means that they had some duties which were considered more important than the duties of ordinary clerks. In the absence of a test who will judge the suitability of the employees for appointment as officiating head clerks? Surely in this case the management is the proper and competent authority, to judge the suitability of candidates for appointment as such, not always by test, but by their own knowledge about the work of different clerks working under them. It may be that in some case there may be some favouritism here and there in the selection of head clerks by the Senior Officer of the Bank as argued by Sri Verma but this favouritism if there be any, cannot be said to be an universal one. The presumption would be that when senior officers of the State Bank of India chooses certain persons for certain posts they do it on their assessment on the performance of the persons concerned. A great deal of discretion surely lies with the management in selecting persons for some posts which do not require either oral or written test. That discretion should be judiciously used. Simply because Shri K. Sharma had no stigma in his service records it cannot be said that he must be found suitable for that job at the relevant time. There are so many things to be taken into consideration in doing so. One and half years of service in the State Bank of India was not considered by the management to be sufficient working and experience on the part of K. N. Sharma to acquire job knowledge working, procedure and other things that were prevailing in the State Bank of India. They were on the spot and they were in the better know of things. It appears that according to them 1-1/2 years service in the State Bank of India was not sufficient to appoint a person as officiating Head clerk and their opinion and decision in this respect was an universal one in case of the most of the erstwhile employees of the Bank of Bihar who had put in more or less about 1-1/2 years service. That discretion by the management was not capriciously used will be apparent from the fact that when Shri Sharma put in about 3 years of service he was considered suitable by the management to be appointed as officiating head clerk and he was put as such. Learned representative of the union submits that the management did

it under pressure as industrial adjudication in respect of Shri K. Sharma was pending before this Tribunal. I have no sufficient materials to accept it. Not that Shri Sharma was singled out for non-appointment as officiating head clerk, that was a decision of that time only and as time progressed he was not only appointed as officiating head clerk but he has gone as far as officer grade II. It shows the absence of any mala fides on the part of the management. It shows absence of any intention on the part of the management to penalise Shri Sharma for some reasons or other. It shows that the discretion used by the management was not injudicious. It shows that no discriminatory treatment was meted out to Shri Sharma. The post is not considered a case of promotion and even if it is considered to be a post of promotion, it is the sole managerial function to appoint a person as acting head clerk or to promote a person as acting head clerk, and so long the rules are not violated and so long there are no mala fides on the part of the management in such appointment or in promotion, the Court has little jurisdiction to interfere with the same.

Shri K. Sharma it appears filed a petition during the pendency of the adjudication that he was not interested to press his claim as head clerk any more due to his subsequent appointment not only as head clerk but also as officer Grade II. It is submitted from the side of the Bank that this letter of Shri Sharma is sufficient to drive a nail in the coffin of the present case. In other words by his letter the industrial dispute does not exist any more. I cannot lend my support to this argument for the reasons as stated by me in the preliminary hearing of the present case. It was further submitted from the side of the management that no industrial dispute existed any more by subsequent appointment of Shri Sharma as Officer Grade II by which he has ceased to be a workman. They have also cited a ruling in this case Greaves Cotton and Co. vrs. their workmen 1971 (II) LLJ 479 (489) S.C. It appears from the above decision that if there are no workmen at all and all of them became non-workmen either during the pendency or at the time of adjudication, the dispute does not survive. In other words the dispute does not remain a dispute between the employers and the workmen within the meaning of S. 2(k) of the I.D. Act. The dispute in this case must be deemed to have lapsed. Sri Kamalan Sharma during the pendency of the adjudication became a supervisory staff by becoming a Grade II Officer of the Bank. He ceased to be a workman. The dispute raised by the workmen no longer remained an industrial dispute as the workmen had no longer direct or substantial interest in his employment or non-employment. So the industrial dispute lapsed and the reference is not maintainable because of changed facts and circumstances.

In the result, the action of the State Bank of India in denying promotion as Head Clerk to Shri Kamalan Sharma a clerk in the Regional Manager's office of the Bank at Patna was justified. The concerned workman is therefore entitled to no relief.

This is my award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

[No. L. 12012/53/72-I.R.III]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

ग्रावेण

नई दिल्ली, 28 अक्टूबर, 1975

का० प्रा० 618.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावह अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में श्री प्यारा जी, खान मालिक, चान्दका खेरे सैन्ट-स्टीन खान, डाकखाना, सम्बाखो, जि० बून्दी की चान्दका-खेरे खान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का

प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

क्या श्री प्याराजी सुपुल श्री मादीप्रो खाल, खान मालिक की चान्द का-खेरे सैंड स्टोन खान, डाकखाना लाम्बाखो, जि० बूंदी (राजस्थान) में नियोजित कर्मकार किन्हीं सवेतन राष्ट्रीय और त्यौहार की छुट्टियों के हकदार हैं ? यदि हाँ, तो किन अवसरों तथा किस वर्ष से हकदार हैं ?

[संख्या एल-29011/114/75-डी-3(बी)]

एल० के० नारायणन, अनुभाग अधिकारी (विशेष)

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th October, 1975

**S.O. 618.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Chand-Ka-Khera Mine of Shri Pyaraji, Mine owner, Chand Ka-Khera Sand Stone Mines, Post Office Lambakho, District Bundi and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the workmen employed in Chand-Ka-Khera Sand Stone Mines, Post Office Lambakho in the District of Bundi (Rajasthan) of Shri Pyaraji, Son of Shri Madiolal, Mine Owner, are entitled for grant of any paid national and festival holidays? If so, on what occasions and from which year?

[No. L. 29011/114/75/DIII/B]

L. K. NARAYANAN, Section Officer (Spl.)

#### प्रारंभ

नई दिल्ली, 12 नवम्बर, 1975

**का० आ० 619.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, रामगुंडम डिवीजन-2, गोदावरी खानी (झारखण्ड) करीमनगर, जिला (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० नरसिंह राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैबराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लि०, रामगुंडम डिवीजन-2, गोदावरी खानी के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, सितम्बर, 1974 में श्री अजयप्रसी के स्थानान्तरण के कारण पैदा हुए, रिक्त स्थान में श्री गानुदाराज मोहम्मद की श्रेणी 6 फिटर के रूप में पथोन्नति न करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एल-21011/14/75-डी-3(बी)]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th November, 1975

**S.O. 619.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division II, Godavari Khani (PO) Karimnagar District (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri T. Narsing Rao as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division II, Godavari Khani in not promoting Sri Gasudaraz Mohd. to Cat. VI Fitter in the vacancy caused due to transfer of Sri Azmathali in September 1974 is justified? If not to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L. 21011/14/75-DIII/B]

#### प्रारंभ

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1975

**का० आ० 620.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में खानस्वामी मैसर्स बन्सल ब्रदर्स की सिलिका बलुआ पथर की खान, आलनपुर, सवाई माधोपुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

क्या खान स्वामी, मैसर्स बन्सल ब्रदर्स, जोहरी बाजार, जयपुर की सवाई माधोपुर जिला (राजस्थान) में आलनपुर सिलिका बलुआ पथर की खानों में नियोजित कर्मकार किसी सवेतन स्वीहारी और राष्ट्रीय अवकाश-दिन की मंजूरी के हकदार हैं ? यदि हाँ, तो किन अवकाश-दिनों के और किस वर्ष से ?

[संख्या एल-29011/117/75-डी 3(बी)]

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1975

**S.O. 620.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Silica Sand Stone Mines of Messrs Bansal Brothers, Mine Owner, Alanpur, Sawaimadhopur, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the workmen employed in Alanpur Silica Sand Mines in the District of Sawaimadhopur, (Rajasthan) of Messrs Bansal Brothers Mine Owners, Johari Bazar Jaipur are entitled for grant of any paid festival and national holidays? If so, on what holidays and from which year?

[No. L. 29011/117/75/DIIB]

## प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 29 नवम्बर, 1975

**का० प्रा० 621.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स डालमिया मैग्नेसाइट कार्पोरेशन, सेलम-5 के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अथ, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी बिरू टो० पालानी प्रपन्न होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

## अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स डालमिया मैग्नेसाइट कार्पोरेशन, सेलम के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की सर्वश्री ए० सामीयान्नन और ए० मरीमुथु, चौकीदारों की क्रमशः

6 अगस्त, 1975 और 14 अगस्त, 1975 से सेवाएं समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एल-29011/127/75-डी० 3(बी)]

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 29th November, 1975

**S.O. 621.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem-5 and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Cen-

tral Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Thiru T. Palaniappan, as Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Management of Messrs Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem, in terminating the services of Sarva Shri A. Samiyannan and A. Marimuthu, Watchmen with effect from 6th August, 1975 and 14th August, 1975 respectively is justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

[No. L-29011/127/75-D. IIB]

## प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 दिसम्बर, 1975

**का० प्रा० 622.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट लिमिटेड की केमली केतरी माइन्स, लाखेरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अथ, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधिन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

## अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनी लिमिटेड के ठेकेदारों मैसर्स सतीश ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी, लाखेरी द्वारा केमली केतरी माइन्स में नियोजित श्रमिकों की मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड कम्पनी लिमिटेड द्वारा लेखा वर्ष 1972-73 के लिए लाभ सहाजन बोनस के भुगतान करने की मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ, तो कर्मकार बोनस की किस प्रमाणा के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एल-29011/2/75-डी-3(बी)]

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th December, 1975

**S.O. 622.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kemli Ketri Mines of Messrs Associated Cement Limited, Lakheri and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of the workmen, employed by Messrs Satish Trading Company, Contractors of Messrs Associated Cement Company Limited, Lakheri, in Kemli Kotri Mines for payment of profit

sharing bonus by Messrs Associated Cement Company Limited, for the accounting year 1972-73 is justified? If so, to what quantum of bonus are the workmen entitled?

[No. L. 29011/2/75/DIIB]

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 12 दिसम्बर, 1975

का० प्रा० 623:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावृद्ध प्रमुखी में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनी लखेरी के केमली कोटरी खानों के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

प्रमुखी

क्या मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनी लि०, लखेरी के कन्ट्रेक्टर मैसर्स सतीश ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी, द्वारा केमली कोटरी खानों में नियोजित कर्मचारों को लेखा वर्ष 1973-74 के लिए मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनी लि० द्वारा लाभ सहभाजन बोनस के भुगतान के लिए मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ, तो उक्त कर्मकार बोनस की कितनी मात्रा के लिए हकदार है?

[सं० एल-29011/109 75-डी-3 (बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1975

**S.O. 623.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kemli Kotri Mines of Messrs Associated Cement Company, Lakheri and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of the workmen employed by Messrs Satish Trading Company, Contractors of Messrs Associated Cement Company Limited, Lakheri in Kemli Kotri Mines for payment of profit sharing bonus by Messrs Associated Cement Company Limited, for the accounting year 1973-74 is justified? If so, to what quantum of bonus are the said workmen entitled?

[No. L-29011/109/75/DIIB]

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1976

**S.O. 624.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem-5 and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1976.

BEFORE THIRU T. PALANIAPPAN, B.A., B.L.,  
PRESIDING OFFICER

Industrial Tribunal, Madras

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Madras, the 31st December, 1975

Industrial Dispute No. 71 of 1975

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between a workman and the management of M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem-5).

BETWEEN

Thiru P. Shanmugham, s/o Perumal, Moongilpadi Post Office (Via) Sanikkavandanur, Karuppur S. O. Salem-12.

AND

The General Manager, Messrs. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem-5 (Pin-636005).

Reference :

Order No L-29011/111/75-D. III. B, dated 20th September, 1975 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiru B. Giridhara Rao for King and Partridge, Advocates for the Management and the worker being absent, upon perusing the reference and all other material papers on record, this Tribunal made the following :

AWARD

The Central Government in their order No. L-29011/111/75-D.III.B, dated 20th September, 1975. Ministry of Labour, have referred a dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Messrs. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem-5 and their workman in respect of the following matter:

"Whether the management of Dalmia Magnesite Corporation was justified in terminating the services of Shri P. Shanmugham, Mines Mazdoor with effect from 4th July, 1974? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The parties were served with summons for the enquiry on 7-11-1975. The worker did not appear in Court on 7-11-75. No claim statement was filed. The management did appear through counsel. The dispute was adjourned to 19-11-1975 to enable the worker to file his claim statement. As the worker was absent on 19-11-1975, notice was issued to him for the hearing on 29-11-1975. He was absent on 29-11-75. Again he was served with notice for the hearing on 31-12-75. Today also he was absent and no claim statement was filed. The worker may at least send his claim statement through post. Though he was served with notices again and again he did not choose to file claim statement or appear in Court. Under those circumstances, above, I come to the conclusion that the worker is not interested in this dispute.

3. An award is passed holding that the worker is not entitled to any relief.

Dated, this 31st day of December, 1975.

T. PALANIAPPAN, Presiding Officer

[No. L. 29011/111/75-DIIB]

S. H. S. IYER, Section Officer, (Spl.)

## प्रदेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 नवम्बर, 1975

क्र० आ० 625.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लि०, डाकखाना—मुगमा (धनबाद) की जामडोही बसन्तीमाता कोयला खान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

## अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लि०, डाकखाना मुगमा, जि० धनबाद की जामडोही बसन्तीमाता कोयलाखान के प्रबन्धतंत्र की निम्नलिखित शक्तियों को 15-5-73 से पदव्युत् करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है :—

क्रम संख्या	नाम	पदनाम
1	2	3
1.	श्री गन्तू बौरी	हालैजखालासी
2.	श्री नसीर मियाँ	खनिक
3.	श्री रामेश्वर मांझी	खनिक
4.	श्री विश्व मांझी	खनिक
5.	श्री कुर्बान मियाँ	खनिक
6.	श्री खेपा बौरी	पम्पखालासी
7.	श्री बाईभा गोप	ट्रैमर
8.	श्री शंकर मलिक	खदान खनिक
9.	श्री मदन राय	ट्रैमर
10.	श्री शंकर राय	ट्रैमर
11.	श्री छट्टू मियाँ	खनिक
12.	श्री भरत सिंह	जनरल मजदूर

यदि नहीं, तो वे किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं ?

[संख्या एल०-20012/116/75-डी-3 ए०]

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th November, 1975

S.O. 625.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Jamdohi Basantimata Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P. O. Mugma (Dhanbad) and their Workmen in respect of the matters Specified in the Schedule hereto annexed,

And Whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Jamdohi Basantimata Colliery of M/S BCC Ltd., P. O. Mugma Distt. Dhanbad is justified in dismissing w.e.f. 15-5-73 the following workmen :—

Sl. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri Ghantu Bouri	Haulage Khalasi
2.	Shri Nasir Mian	Miner
3.	Shri Rameshwar Manjhi	Miner
4.	Shri Vishwa Manjhi	Miner
5.	Shri Kurban Mian	Miner
6.	Shri Khepa Bouri	Pump Khalasi
7.	Shri Bala Gope	Trammer
8.	Shri Shankar Mullick	Quarry Miner
9.	Shri Madan Rai	Trammer
10.	Shri Shankar Rai	Trammer
11.	Shri Chutu Mian	Miner
12.	Shri Bharat Singh	General Mazdoor

If not, to what relief are they entitled to ?

[No. L. 20012/116/75/DIHA]

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1976

S.O. 626.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Cum Labour Court, No. 3, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of SIMLABAHAL Colliery, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th January, 1976.

CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 40 of 1969

Presiding Officer : Shri S. N. Johri, B. Sc., LL.M.

Parties :—Employers in relation to the management of Simlabahal Colliery, P. O. Jharia, Distt. Dhanbad.

AND

Their workman represented by Krantikari Koyla Mazdoor Sangh.

## APPEARANCES :

For Employers—Sri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate represented the B.C.C. Ltd.

For Workmen—Sri G. Prasad, Advocate.

Industry—Coal.

State—Bihar.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 7th January, 1976

## AWARD

This reference has been made by the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour Vide its Order No. 2/87/69-LRII dated 18-6-69 projecting the following question for adjudication :

“Whether the management of Simlabahal Colliery are justified in refusing employment to their workman Shri Gokul Bouri, Bankman, with effect from 26th November, 1968? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

Parties entered into a settlement from 18th July, 1974 under which it was agreed that the workman shall be provided with employment in any colliery of Bharat Coking Coal Limited which is now the employer in relation to Simlabahal Colliery; he shall be so employed with continuity of service but without any back wages. The Union agreed to give up all other claims with respect to this dispute. The

workman should report for duty to the General Manager, Area No. 4 within 15 days of the settlement failing which his claim for employment will be forfeited. The parties have prayed to answer the reference in terms of the settlement.

The reference is answered accordingly. The copy of the settlement shall form part of the award as Annexure 'A'.

Enc : Annexure 'A'

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.

The award is submitted to the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour as required by Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.

#### ANNEXURE 'A'

#### MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

In the dispute under Reference No. 40 of 1969 relating to Simlabahal Colliery pending before Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, at Dhanbad.

#### Representatives of Employers :

1. Sri G. S. Jootla, G. M. Area No. IV.
2. Sri K. C. Nandkeolyar, A.P.M. Area No. IV.

#### Representative of workmen:

1. Shri S. K. Rai, General Secretary, Krantikari Koyla Mazdoor Sangh.

This case which has been pending proceeding before the above noted Tribunal, has been discussed between the parties represented by the above named representatives, and amicably settled on the following terms :—

1. That Sri Gokul Bouri, Banksman will be provided with employment in any colliery of Bharat Coking Coal Limited with continuity of service, but without any back wages.
2. That the Union will give up all other claims made in the present dispute.
3. That the workman will report for duty to the General Manager, Area No. 4 within 15 days of this settlement, failing which his claim for employment will be forfeited.
4. That the parties agree to file a petition of compromise settlement before the Tribunal on the above terms.

#### Employers Representatives:

1. G. S. Jootla,
2. K. C. Nandkeolyar.

S. K. RAI

#### Union Representative:

S. K. Rai

Dated : 8th July, 1974

[No. 2/87/69-LRII/DHIA]

**S.O. 627.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Ltd., P.O. Bhurkunda, District Hazari Bagh and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1976.

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 25 of 1974

In the matter of an industrial disputes under Section 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Ministry's Order No. L-2012/163/73-LRII, dated 26-10-74)

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Bhurkunda, District Hazaribagh.

#### AND

Their Workmen.

#### PRESENT :

Shri X. K. Sarkar, Judge, Presiding Officer

#### APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Employers—Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

On behalf of the Workmen —Shri P. K. Bosc, Advocate.

State : Bihar

Industry : Coal  
Dhanbad, dated the 6th January, 1976.

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, sent the reference concerned to his Tribunal for adjudication of the industrial disputes involved with the following issues framed:

"(1) Whether the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Bhurkunda, District Hazaribagh was justified in dismissing Shri M. K. B. Menon, Mechanic Grade-1 from the 29th September, 1973.

(2) If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

The case of the employers is as follows :

On 8-9-73 at about 9.00 A.M. while Shri Menon, the concerned workman, was on duty, Shri R. Prasad, Deputy Chief Engineer (Excavation) asked him to do some job. Shri Menon got infuriated and snatched away spectacles of Shri R. Prasad, caught hold of his wrist and otherwise threatened him to the effect that he would throw him out physically. This amounts to gross misconduct on the part of Shri Menon and a chargesheet was issued against him under clause 17(1) (r)(g) of the Certified Standing Orders. Shri Menon submitted his explanation on 13-9-73 admitting the incident but denied that he had any ulterior motive. The domestic enquiry was held by Shri I. Chandra, Colliery Manager who was appointed as an Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer held enquiry on 19-9-73 in which the concerned workman participated. In the domestic enquiry Shri Menon admitted having taken of the spectacles of Shri R. Prasad and caught hold of his wrist. The Enquiry Officer held that the misconduct under clause 17(1)(r) had been established but other charge under clause 17(1)(g) had not been established. The Deputy Chief Engineer, Bhurkunda accepted the findings of the Enquiry Officer and considering gravity of the misconduct and past conduct of Shri Menon dismissed him from service with effect from 29-9-73. The employers submit that the reference is incompetent inasmuch as no industrial disputes was ever raised by the workmen with them at any time about the justifiability of dismissing Shri Menon. The case of the workmen is that the Deputy Chief Engineer (Excavation) Shri R. Prasad misbehaved with the concerned workman in connection with some work. The only thing the concerned workman did was to protest against the insulting misbehaviour of Shri Prasad. The workman challenged the domestic enquiry being not properly and fairly conducted and maintained that the principles of natural justice were violated. It is further maintained that the charge against the concerned workman could not be established under the domestic enquiry. It is further contended that as the concerned workman is a active and energetic member of the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh he incurred the displeasure of the management.

The position of law in regard to the domestic enquiry has been pronounced by the Supreme Court and other High Courts in many cases. To quote a few I may refer the case of Delhi Cloth and General Mills Co. (P) Ltd.-vs-Ludh Bndh Singh (A.I.R. 1972 S.C. 1031) and workmen of Messrs Fire-



stone Tyre & Rubber Co. of India (P) Ltd.-vs-management (L.L.J. 1 1973 S.C. 278/279). The essence of the above decisions is that it is open to the Tribunal to deal in the first instances, as preliminary issue, the validity of the domestic enquiry. If the finding on the preliminary issue is in the favour of the management then no additional evidence need be cited by the management. If however finding on preliminary issue is against the management the Tribunal is to give an opportunity to them to cite additional evidence. Here before me the parties confined their cases to the validity or otherwise of the domestic enquiry and evidence was also adduced before me in this connection only. Accordingly I may proceed with the well settled law about the validity or otherwise of the domestic enquiry and the consequences flowing from the same. It is admitted by the workmen in their written statement that the chargesheet was issued to the concerned workmen on 8-9-73 to which reply was sent by him on 12-9-73 denying the charges. Admittedly, the enquiry officer held the domestic enquiry in which the concerned workman participated and the Enquiry Officer after concluding his enquiry found him guilty of the charge of misconduct under the above clause. In the written statement the workmen challenged the domestic enquiry and the order of dismissal as follows :

"A show of enquiry was held on 19-9-73 and it was over within 2/3 hours. That the enquiry officer was biased against the concerned workman from the very beginning. He did not conduct the enquiry properly and the concerned workman was not allowed sufficient scope to defend himself; the charges against him could not be established."

The learned Advocate for the workmen who conducted the case of the workmen before me submits that the concerned workman is a workman in factory and not in mines and accordingly the controlling officer of the concerned workman is the Executive Engineer who is alone competent to issue chargesheet. The Manager of the colliery who issued the chargesheet has no locus standi and the charge-sheet issued by him is invalid. It is further submitted by him that as Shri Menon was a workman in workshop and not in mines, the certified Standing Orders did not apply in his case. It will therefore appear that the above argument the very root of the domestic enquiry is sought to be uprooted. I should see the fact and law in this respect to ascertain the correct position. Ext. M30 is the certified Standing Orders which provide in the beginning that these are certified standing orders of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Ranchi in respect of their collieries situated in the State of Bihar and other States as certified by Regional Labour Commissioner (V) and Certifying Officer, New Delhi. It would further appear from the standing orders that these are applicable to all mines situated in the State of Bihar and other States and these will apply to all workman employed in any colliery or mines of N.C.D.C. Ltd. including establishment and section located within the premises of mines. Admittedly Bhurkunda colliery in which the concerned workman was employed is a colliery in the State of Bihar belonging to N.C.D.C. Ltd. In the order of reference the industrial dispute has been stated to be existing between the management of Bhurkunda colliery and their workmen. It appears from the telegram sent to the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Hazaribagh by the Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Bhurkunda that Shri Menon was admitted to be a Mechanic of Bhurkunda colliery. That Bhurkunda colliery is not a colliery at all is not the case of the workmen. MW. 1 Shri I. Chandra, Manager of Bhurkunda colliery has no doubt said in his cross-examination that Bhurkunda colliery was a project and the chief of the project is the Project Officer designated as Deputy Chief Mining Engineer. It may be a project but the fact remains that the term 'project' does not detract from definition of colliery. It appears that the Bhurkunda colliery was colliery in the past and has been a colliery in the present. The fact that in the past Bhurkunda colliery of project as it may be, was dealt with as a colliery will appear from charge sheet issued to the concerned workmen previously (Ext. M18, 19 and 20 etc.). Then again it will appear from the standing orders page 7 that same would also apply to establishment or section located within the premises of a mine even though that may not be under control of the manager or agent of the mine. No sufficient evidence has been adduced before me to show that the project, as it has been called, is not located within the premises of the mine. Taking all these into consideration I do not find sufficient materials to hold that Bhurkunda colliery or project as it may be does not

attract the provisions of the standing orders. For all these reasons I hold that the workmen of Bhurkunda colliery and for that matter the concerned workman is governed by the certified standing orders (Ext.M30). If that be so the colliery Manager has locus standi to issue a charge-sheet and the charge-sheet so issued cannot be invalid. The next point urged before me by the learned Advocate appearing for the workmen is that Shri I. Chandra, Colliery Manager of Bhurkunda colliery was directed by Shri Malpuri, Mines Manager to hold the domestic enquiry and so it is a case of one manager asking another manager to conduct the enquiry which is said to be bad in law and fact. I may mention in this connection that no such point appears to have been taken by the workmen in their written statement. I have no materials to hold that the above action is bad in law and in fact. It is in evidence of MW1 that there were three managers at the relevant time in Bhurkunda colliery and the Deputy Chief Mining Engineer in Bhurkunda colliery was above the managers. It appears from Ext. M10 which is order of the Deputy Chief Mining Engineer, Bhurkunda that he accepted the findings of the Enquiry Officer and issued the order of dismissal of Shri Menon. So even if it is assumed for the argument's sake without admitting it that there was some irregularity as alleged by the learned Advocate of the workmen the same was cured by the action of the Deputy Chief Mining Engineer emanating from Ext.M10. The next point raised before me from the side of the workmen is that the Enquiry Officer himself put questions to the management's witnesses but did not allow their cross-examination by the concerned workman. The Enquiry Officer in domestic enquiry is supposed to be an independent person and his position is like that of a domestic court or Tribunal to the parties. I think that the Enquiry Officer is entitled to put questions to the witnesses for clarifications and in that case there remains little scope to allow the concern workman an opportunity to cross-examine on the clarification sought by the Enquiry Officer. I do not find much substance in this part of the argument and I do not think that this vitiates the domestic enquiry. The next point urged before me by the learned Advocate for the workmen is that the enquiry was held on 19-9-1973 and so the workman could not get sufficient opportunity to defend himself in the domestic enquiry and to bring his witness. It appears that the workman got notice of enquiry to be held on 15-9-73. As the workman did not appear on that day the date of enquiry was shifted to 19-9-73 and the concerned workman was duly notified about the same. The time may be considered a little short i.e. 15th to 19th. There is nothing to show before me that the concerned workman requested the Enquiry Officer to defer the date of enquiry so that he could bring his witnesses. If there was such a request I could have considered this fact along with the other facts and circumstances. On the other hand it appears that the concerned workman duly took part in the enquiry on 19th and cross-examined the witnesses examined by the management. It does not appear that he raised any point then or thereafter that he was prejudiced in any way for the enquiry being held on 19th. I do not find that the concerned workman was denied the opportunity of his defence in the domestic enquiry in the absence of materials in this respect. Another question raised is that the enquiry was conducted in English which prevented the concerned workman in understanding the proceedings. It will appear from some documents marked Ext. M11, 12 and 13 that the concerned workman himself addressed three letters on different dates to the Executive Engineer written and signed in English. The above fact does not show that the concerned workman was incapable in understanding the proceeding in English. Moreover there is evidence that the enquiry proceeding was explained to the concerned workman by the Enquiry Officer. There is little substance on this point. There is also no evidence of any biasness of Enquiry Officer against the concerned workman. There is nothing to show that the enquiry was not properly and fairly conducted and I do not also see that the principles of natural justice have been violated by the Enquiry Officer in the matter of domestic enquiry. One thing I may say in this connection which will relegate the points raised from the side of the workmen to a secondary position. In the admitted reply to the charge-sheet of Shri Menon he admits having removed the spectacle of Shri R. Prasad and caught hold of his hand when Shri Prasad remarked to the concerned workman that he had made the machine a 'mandir'. He however said that he had no ulterior motive. In his evidence before the Enquiry Officer Shri Menon admitted that when he was asked for commissioning the machine he took off the spectacle of Shri Prasad. He however says that he lost his temper and the above incident happened in the heat of moment. According to the standing orders the



above act of Shri Menon amounts to misconduct, more so when he misbehaved with a senior officer in the above manner. Well, the admission of Shri Menon remains like that both in reply to the chargesheet and in his statements before the Enquiry Officer. The question of his being denied an opportunity of sufficient defence pales into insignificance. The Enquiry Officer can as well be said to have found him guilty on admission before him, no matter whether there was little technical defect here or there as alleged by the workmen. I am now to see if the findings of Enquiry Officer were preverse. I have gone through the proceeding of the domestic enquiry and there was sufficient evidence before the Enquiry Officer about the conduct meted out by Shri Menon to Shri R. Prasad. So the findings of the domestic enquiry by the Enquiry Officer was supported by evidence and his finding is not opposed to the whole body of evidence in the domestic enquiry. I am again to see whether under Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act I can disagree with the findings of the Enquiry Officer or if I can afford to lower the punishment to some extent. The evidence before the Enquiry Officer about the misconduct of Shri Menon was plentiful and I do not feel inclined to disagree with his findings. With regard to the mitigation of punishment I find the punishment as awarded to the concerned workman by the employers in not improper. There is no evidence before me worth the name to show that there was any cause of provocation to Shri Menon to take the 'whlphand'. If I am permitted to say here I may say in this connection that sudden provocation is a mitigating factor in serious crimes committed by an accused. This does not appear to be the case here. Shri R. Prasad was a senior officer and the treatment meted out to him was most unbecoming of a senior mechanic like Shri Menon. From the materials on record it appears that it is not the first time that Shri Menon had this misconduct but on previous occasions also he was departmentally proceeded against for other misconduct and some punishment was awarded to him. I do not mean to say that it is a case of previous conviction to aggravate the punishment. In the circumstances I do not feel called upon to interfere with the punishment meted out to Shri Menon by the employers. Taking into consideration the fact and circumstances of the case and the findings on record I find that the domestic enquiry as conducted by the Enquiry Officer was properly and validly held and the preliminary hearing on the validity of the domestic enquiry is found in favour of the employers. As we know that the Industrial Tribunal does not act as appellate Tribunal for the actions of the management and substitute the judgment of the Enquiry Officer by its own judgment where there is nothing wrong in the domestic enquiry. There arises no question of allowing the parties to adduce evidence on merit.

On the points of law, the case of the management is that the Reference is incompetent as no industrial dispute was raised with the management with regard to the justifiability of the dismissal of Shri Menon. The workmen maintain that an industrial dispute was duly raised. The position of law is that an industrial dispute must be raised with the management before the Conciliation Officer gets his jurisdiction to conciliate. Raising of an industrial dispute with the Labour Commissioner in the first instance does not serve the purpose. Ext. W1 is said to be the letter by the Secretary of the local union by which the alleged industrial dispute was raised. The case of the management is that no such letter was received by them. Shri K. C. Choudhury, W.W.1 who was the Branch Secretary of the union says that he delivered the original of Ext. W1 to Dy. Chief Mining Engineer when a delegation of workmen went to wait upon him in connection with the dismissal of Shri Menon. Now it does not appear from the pleading that any delegation of workmen went to wait upon the Dy. Chief Mining Engineer after the dismissal of Shri Menon. When the management took a point in their pleading in this respect, the union ought to have specifically stated in their written statement that they had delivered the letter to Dy. Chief Mining Engineer. There is no other evidence or papers from the side of the union in this respect. According to the management the confirmation copy of the telegram sent to A.L.C. is the only thing they received. In this telegram it was nowhere mentioned that the union's representation to the management was turned down. In the facts and circumstances of the case I can only say that the case of the union in this respect has not been satisfactorily established before me. If that be so it can be said that no industrial dispute was raised with the management and so the reference is not maintainable.

In the result the action of the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Bhurkunda, District Hazaribagh was justified in dismissing Shri M. K. B. Menon, Mechanic Grade —I from the 29th September, 1973. He is entitled to no relief. This is my award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

[No. L-2012/163/73-LRII/DIIB]

G. C. SAXENA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1976

**S.O. 628.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1976.

# BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 37 of 1975

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District.

AND

The Management of Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District.

## APPEARANCES :

The General Secretary, A. P. Mica Labour Union, Gudur, Nellore District—For Workmen.

The Manager, Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District—For Management.

## AWARD

The Government of India in Ministry of Labour through notification No. L-28012/2/75-D-JV-(B) dated 20th August, 1975 referred the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District and their Workmen under Section 7A and 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication by the Tribunal on the following issue :

"Whether the action of the management of Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District in dismissing Shri Garla Venkataiah, Blaster with effect from the 9th May, 1975 was justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The reference was registered as I. D. No. 37 of 1975 and notices were directed to the workman and to the management. On behalf of the workman a claim statement was filed by C. C. Subbaiah, the General Secretary, Andhra Pradesh Mica Labour Union, Gudur, Nellore District. It is inter-alia alleged therein that the workman Garla Venkataiah was working as a blaster in Seetharama Mica Mine, Kalichedu and the management of the respondent mine approached and brought him to this Mine to work as a blaster in the year 1971. The workman was being paid at the rate of Rs. 165 per month. The workman is alleged to have applied to the management for leave from 1-4-1975 to 8-4-1975 as he was suffering from Jaundice. As he has not fully recovered his health, he has to extent his leave but the Manager is said to have torn his application and insisted upon him to join duty immediately on 9-4-1975. But the workman could not do so as he was not fully recovered. He therefore appeared for duty on 14-4-75 but the management did not allow him to join duty. The management thereafter asked him as to why he was absent till 14-4-75. Though the workman submitted his application, the manage-

ment held the explanation as unsatisfactory out of ulterior motive and demanded an undertaking. It is alleged that the nature of the undertaking demanded by the management was not specific. The workman is alleged to have appeared at the factory every day from 14-4-75 onwards but he was not allowed to duty. The management issued a notice on 22-4-75 to which he gave his explanation. Even there after he was not admitted to duty. He was thus made to appear at the Mine everyday and ultimately he was removed from service on 9-5-75. It is contended that the stand of the management that the workman was absent without leave from 9-4-75 to 9-5-75 is incorrect, in as much as the workman has applied for leave from 9-4-75 to 13-4-75, and as he attended his duty on 14-4-75 and on all subsequent days till 9-5-75, but the management did not admit him to duty. This is alleged to be an unfair labour practice on the part of the management. Hence the claim of the workman for reinstatement with back wages.

3. In the counter filed by the management it is alleged that the workman joined their mine from 28-4-71 as a blaster. It is alleged that the workman was absenting himself frequently without leave and that several times he was warned for habitual absence. It is alleged that the workman absented himself from 17-3-75 to 24-3-75 without any prior leave. On 23-3-75 the management received a post-Card under certificate of posting asking leave from 16-3-75 to 23-3-75 on the ground that the workman was suffering from jaundice. The period of leave sought for is alleged to be incorrect. On 16-3-75 the workman was on duty and on 24-3-75 he was absent. Again the workman absented himself from 31-3-75 onwards. On 6-4-75 the management again received another letter dated 2-4-75 asking leave upto 8-4-75. On 14-4-75 the workman presented himself for duty. He was thus asked to explain his overstay from 8-4-75 to 13-4-75 and an undertaking was demanded from the workman that he will not absent himself without prior sanction. In his reply the workman is said to have alleged that he applied leave from 1-4-75 to 9-4-75. It is denied that the workman applied for leave for 9-4-75. It is alleged that the workman refrained from giving any undertaking. The job of a blaster is said to be a responsible post, and that job is performed by a competent person possessing blaster's competency certificate granted by the mines department. It is alleged that blasting is a very important operation. The frequent absence of a blaster is said to impede the operations of the mine. The frequent absence of the workman without previous intimation is said to betray his lack of sense of responsibility. In order to promote regular attendance a solemn undertaking was demanded from the workman, though on previous occasions he was warned on 28-1-72, 22-8-73 and 5-6-74 for his absence without prior permission. Since the workman did not give the undertaking demanded of him, the management issued a notice dated 22-4-75 for his continued absence. For this there was no reply from the workman and therefore the management issued a show cause notice dated 3-5-75 alleging that though the workman applied for leave only upto 8-4-75 he continued to be absent without extending his leave, for more than 10 days, from 9-4-75 to 3-5-75 resulting in forfeiture of his lien as per standing order 6(a). In the explanation given by the workman on 6-5-75 it is alleged that he has not explained the point raised in the notice but only stated that he was suffering from chickenpox from 26-4-75. The workman is also said to have alleged that he addressed a letter dated 22-4-75 to the management. But this is denied by the management. It is also alleged by the management that the digit 22 was over written by on 26. In that reply the workman is said to have sought for compensation, which according to the management indicated that the workman was not willing to work. Therefore the management issued a final notice on 9-5-75 intimating that his name has been removed from the register without any claim for compensation. It is also alleged that in the previous years the workman absented himself for a large number of days without permission. The workman is said to have exhausted his earned leave even in the first three months of the year itself. The refusal of the workman to give an undertaking not to absent himself, it is contended was indicative of this lack of sense of responsibility. In those circumstances the management sought to justify its stand. It is denied that the workman was working as a blaster in Seetharama Mica Mine before he joined this mine. On the other hand it is alleged that the workman was working as a driller in Seetharama Mica Mine and left that service on 10-11-1970. It is thus contended that the workman was without any

work from 10-11-70 to 28-4-71 on which date he joined this service. The claim statement of the workman is said to suffer from untruths. Thus the statement of the workman that he was suffering either from jaundice or from chickenpox was sought to be doubted by the management in the absence of any certificate issued by the competent authority. The management however expressed its desire to take back the workman back into service provided he gave an undertaking for better behaviour in future.

4. At the stage of enquiry the management sent a letter enclosing a memo of settlement dated 12-12-75. That settlement is signed by the workman as well as the general Secretary C. C. Subbaiah and also by the manager. Notices were directed to the workman and to his representative and the management for verification of this settlement. The parties sent a joint petition stating that in the pursuance of the compromise the workman was already taken into service and that he also received a sum of Rs. 100. The receipt is also enclosed to the petition. Both of them prayed to treat the dispute as withdrawn. In the circumstances there is no option but to accept the settlement and the only question for consideration is whether the settlement is fair and reasonable so that it can be made the basis of an award.

5. Under the said settlement the management agreed to reinstate the workman immediately and his absence from 9-5-75 to 2-12-75 was agreed to be treated as leave without wages. Further the management agreed to pay Rs. 100 as exgratia. The workman also undertook under the said settlement to join duty on 4-12-1975 and further agreed to withdraw the dispute pending before this Tribunal in view of the mutual settlement. This settlement also bears the signature of Mr. C. C. Subbaiah the general Secretary of the Mica Labour Union who submitted and signed the claim statement on behalf of the workman. The Settlement in view of the Secretary also signing it and in view of the subsequent memo can be said to be genuine. The settlement and its authority cannot be doubted having regard to the terms of the settlement. It also does not appear unreasonable for the workman as he is reinstated and also got some amount as exgratia, paid towards the back wages. The settlement thus meets the principal demand of the workman. In the circumstances the settlement can be said to be just and fair and it can as well form the basis of an award.

In the result award is passed accordingly in terms of the settlement. A copy of the settlement is enclosed to this award.

Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 30th day of December, 1975.

#### APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

NIL

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)

AT HYDERABAD.

Industrial Dispute No. 37/75

BETWEEN:

The Management Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District.

AND

The Workmen, Kalyanram Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District.

Dated, 2nd December, 1975

Memo submitted by both of the Parties

This dispute is in respect of Garla Venkataiah, Blaster, in Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu. This matter is at present pending in this Honourable Tribunal.

Meanwhile both the parties have compromised in this matter the terms of which are:—

1. The management have agreed to reinstate Garla Venkataiah into service immediately.
2. The period of his absence from 9-5-1975 to 2-12-1975 will be treated as leave without wages.
3. The management have agreed to pay Garla Venkataiah, Rs. 100/- rupees one hundred only, as ex-gratia.
4. Garla Venkataiah will join duty either on 3rd or 4th December 1975.
5. Garla Venkataiah and his Union have agreed to withdraw the dispute, Industrial Dispute No. 37 of 1975, as the parties have come to mutual settlement over the matter. Therefore the Honourable Court may be pleased to accept this mutual agreement and treat this dispute as withdrawn.

For the Management:

1. Sd/- Manager.

For the Workmen

1. Sd/- Garla Venkataiah

2. Sd/- C. C. Subbaiah, General Secretary, A. P. Mica Labour Union.

True Copy

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL.

[No. L. 28012/2/75-D-IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 17th January, 1976.

**S.O. 629.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs S. Lal and Company, Owners Jhilling Langlota Iron Ore Mines, Post Office Jajang, District Keonjhar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th January, 1976.

#### INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BHUBANESWAR

##### PRESENT:

Dr. B. N. Misra, LL.M. (London), Ph.D. (London),  
Bar-at-Law, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal,  
Bhubaneswar.

Industrial Dispute Case No. 1 of 1974 (Central),  
Bhubaneswar, the 12th January 1976.

##### BETWEEN

The employers in relation to Messrs S. Lal and Company, owners of Jhilling Langlota Iron Ore Mines, Post Office Jajang, via Joda, District Keonjhar.—  
First-party

##### AND

Their Workmen—Second-party

##### APPEARANCES:

Shri S. K. Jain—for the first-party

Sri D. C. Mohanty, President, Keonjhar Mines & Forest Workers' Union.

Sri D. Satpathy, Vice-President, Keonjhar Mines & Forest Workers' Union.—For the second-party.

Sri D. Roy Joint Secretary, Keonjhar Mines & Forest Workers' Union.

##### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7-A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government had referred the following dispute to my predecessor for adjudication vide Government of India Order No. 26011 dated 10-6-1974:

"Whether the action of Messrs S. Lal and Company, owners Jhilling Langlota Iron Ore Mines, Post Office Jajang via Joda, District Keonjhar in dismissing on the dates shown against each, the following workmen engaged at the above mine was legal and justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

1. P. B. Maity, Typist	27-12-73
2. Makardwaj, Miner	27-12-73
3. Chakravarty Das, Miner	27-12-73
4. Brusavxa Pradhan, Miner	27-12-73
5. Sridhar Munda, Miner	19-11-73
6. Sunca Munda, Miner	19-11-73
7. L. D. Prusty, Challan Mate	27-12-73
8. Madhu Munda, Miner	2-1-74
9. Siba Prasad Sitari	2-1-74
10. Smt. Jani Dei, Miner	2-1-74
11. Birabhadra	2-1-74
12. Mayadhar Pradhan	2-1-74
13. Gangadhar Munda	2-1-74."

2. Subsequently the Central Government have transferred the above dispute to me for disposal vide Government of India Order No. 26011 dated 17-9-1975.

3. The first-party management and the second-party workmen through the Keonjhar Mines and Forest Workers' Union, Barbil have entered appearance. The Union has filed a written-statement in support of the case of the workmen. The first-party have sent a letter dated 22-7-1974 together with enclosures.

4. It is not necessary to go into the merits of the dispute as parties have compromised and settled their dispute. Both parties have filed a joint petition of compromise stating therein that in the interest of industrial peace and harmony the Union and the Management have mutually and amicably settled their disputes. Accordingly they have prayed that the settlement should be accepted as full and final between the parties and the award be passed in terms of the settlement. Parties have also filed the memorandum of settlement in Form 'H'. Parties have admitted the terms of the compromise recorded in the memorandum of settlement and their signatures thereon before the Tribunal. They have further stated that the compromise has been fairly and properly entered into and is in the best interest of industrial peace and that concerned workmen have already joined their duties as per the terms of compromise.

5. Hence award is passed in this dispute in terms of the settlement as contained in the memorandum of settlement which shall form part of the award.

B. N. MISRA, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal,  
Bhubaneswar., 12-1-76

##### MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

1. Name of the parties M/s. S. LAL & Co. Ltd. having its registered office at 10, Camac Street Calcutta-17 in respect of their mines namely Jhiling Langlota Iron Ore Mine and Manganese Mines P.O. Jajang Via Joda in the District of Keonjhar, Orissa.

##### AND

Their workmen represented by Keonjhar Mines and Forest Workmen Unions Barbil, Dist. Keonjhar, Orissa.

2. Representing the employer. R. L. Bathwal, President of the Company.

3. Representing the workmen. D. C. Mohanty President, Dinabandhu Satapathy, Vice President, and Jt. Secretary of Keonjhar Mines and Forest workmen Unions-Barbil.

## SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE.

The management terminated the services of the following workers.

1. Sri P. B. Maity, Typist.
2. Shri Makardwaja, Miner.
3. Shri Chakrabarty Das, Miner.
4. Shri Brushava Pradhan, Miner.
5. Shri Sridhar Munda, Miner
6. Sunaka Munda, Miner
7. Shri L. D. Prusti, Challan Mate.
8. Shri Madhu Munda, Miner.
9. Shri Sivaprasad, Sitari.
10. Smt. Jani Dei, Miner
11. Sri Bira Bhadra.
12. Sri Mayadhar Pradhan.
13. Sri Gangadhar Munda.

The Union took up the case and dispute was finally referred to Adjudication vide Govt. Order No. L. 26011/1/LRIV dated 10th June, 1974. During this period the representatives of the Union and the management had mutually discussions out of the court and after appreciating the stand-point of each other and after having probed into the different aspects of the case, came to the following terms of settlement amicably in the interest of industrial peace and harmony.

## TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

1. It is agreed that the following workmen terminated as per previous orders of the management shall be taken back in their previous posts with effect from 23-4-75 and the period of absence shall be treated as special leave without wages. The names of the workmen are :—

- (a) Sri Makardwaj, Miner.
- (b) Sri Brushava Pradhan, Miner.
- (c) Sri Sridhar Munda, Miner.
- (d) Sri Sunaka Munda, Miner.
- (e) Sri L. D. Prusti, Challan Mate.
- (f) Sri Madhu Munda, Miner.
- (g) Sri Siba Prasad Sitary.
- (h) Smt. Jani Dei, Miner.
- (i) Sri Bira Bhadra.
- (j) Sri Naydhar Pradhan.
- (k) Sri Gangadhar Munda.

2. It is agreed that the workmen shall confirm to the provisions of the standing orders of the Company and any violation shall henceforth be taken up as per law.

3. It is agreed that the Unions shall not reagitate the cases of Sri P. B. Maity and Chakravarty Das Sl. 1 and 3 of the said Govt. order before the tribunal or raise any dispute whatsoever as these workmen have settled up their cases with the management out of free violation.

4. It is agreed that the management and the Union shall jointly submit this settlement before the Industrial Tribunal and request the Tribunal to accept this settlement as full and final settlement of the dispute pending before it and to pass an award on the lines of this memorandum of settlement. Dated the 17th June, 1975.

For the Management.

For S. LAL & CO. Ltd.,  
Sd/- R. L. Bathwal,  
President.

For the workmen.

Sd/-  
D. Mohanty, President.  
KMFV Union.  
Sd/-  
Dinbandhu Satapathy,  
Vice President.  
Sd/-  
D. Ray, Jt. Secy.

[No. L-26011(1)/74-LRIV/D-IV(B)]  
BHUPENDRA NATH, Section Officer (Spl.)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जनवरी 1976

का० प्रा० 630.—खान स्वामियों के हितों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिये, श्री बी० जी० प्रधान को केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा कोयला खान बचाव-नियम, 1969 के नियम 3 के उपनियम (1) के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय कोयला खान बचाव आस्थान समिति के सदस्य के रूप में नाम-निर्दिष्ट किया गया था ।

तथा उक्त श्री प्रधान उन हितों का प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं कर रहे हैं जिनकी ओर से वह नामनिर्दिष्ट किये गये थे, अतः, उक्त नियमों के नियम 6 के अधीन वह उक्त समिति के सदस्य नहीं रह गये हैं ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त नियमों के नियम 3 के उपनियम (1) के खण्ड (ii) के अनुसरण में श्री के० पी० सिंह, महा प्रबन्धक, क्षेत्र सं० 4, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड को, खान स्वामियों के हितों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिये श्री बी० जी० प्रधान के स्थान पर उक्त समिति का सदस्य नामनिर्दिष्ट करती है और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 1261, तारीख 3 अप्रैल, 1965 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "सदस्य" शीर्षक के नीचे क्रम सं० 2 सामने, स्तम्भ 2 में प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जायेगी, अर्थात :—

"श्री के० पी० सिंह,  
महा प्रबन्धक  
क्षेत्र सं० 4  
भारत कोकिंगकोल लिमिटेड  
डाक घर कस्टोर (धनबाद) ।"

[का० सं० यू० 23019/1/74-एम आई]

जे० सी० सक्सेना, अधीक्षक

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1976

S.O. 630.—Whereas Shri B. G. Pradhan was nominated by the Central Government as a member of the Central Coal Mines Rescue Stations Committee, constituted, under sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the Coal Mines Rescue Rules, 1959, to represent the interests of mine owners;

And whereas the said Shri Pradhan has ceased to represent the interest on whose behalf he was nominated and has, therefore, ceased to be a member of the said Committee under rule 6 of the said rules;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of clause (ii) of sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the said rules, the Central Government hereby nominates Shri K. P. Singh, General Manager, Area No. 4, Bharat Coking Coal Limited, as a member of the said Committee, vice Shri B. G. Pradhan, to represent the interests of mine owners, and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1261, dated the 3rd April, 1975, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "MEMBERS", against serial number 2, for the entry in column 2, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Shri K. P. Singh,  
General Manager,  
Area No. 4,  
Bharat Coking Coal Limited,  
Post Office Kustore (Dhanbáu)".

[File No. U. 23019/1/74-MI]

J. C. SAXENA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1976

का० घ्रा० 631—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री के० राज-शेखर राव को उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन स्थापन के संबंध में या रेल कम्पनी, महापरतन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित स्थापन के संबंध में या ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्य में विभाग या शाखाएं हों, सम्पूर्ण तमिलनाडु राज्य और पाण्डिचेरी संघ राज्यक्षेत्र के लिये निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए० 12016(15)/75-पी० एफ० 1 (i)]

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1976

**S.O. 631.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. Rajasekhara Rao to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu and the Union territory of Pondicherry for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A. 12016(15)/75-PF.I(i)]

का० घ्रा० 632—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के

भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० घ्रा० 626 तारीख 19 अप्रैल, 1958 को, जहां तक उसका सम्बन्ध श्री टी० एस०, लक्ष्मी नारायणन् से है विखण्डित करती है।

[सं० ए० 12016(15)/75-पी० एफ० I (ii)]

**S.O. 632.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 626 dated the 19th April, 1958 so far as it relates to Shri T. S. Lakshmi Narayanan.

[No. A. 12016(15)/75-PF-I(ii)]

का० घ्रा० 633—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० घ्रा० 1183 तारीख 16 जून, 1958 को, जहां तक उसका सम्बन्ध श्री टी० वी० सूर्य नारायणन् से है विखण्डित करती है।

[सं० ए० 12016(15)/75-पी० एफ० I (iii)]

एस० एस० सहस्रानामन, उप सचिव

**S.O. 633.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1183 dated the 16th June, 1958 so far as it relates to Shri T. V. Suryanarayanan.

[No. A. 12016(15)/75-PF-I(iii)]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Dy. Secy.

